

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SOCIAL SECURITY CUTBACKS
OPPOSED

HON. NORMAN E. D'AMOURS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. D'AMOURS. Mr. Speaker, many citizens are quite rightly upset about recent proposals to cut back essential social security benefits. For many citizens the modest benefits they receive represent the difference between being able to maintain their independence and dignity and living in constant fear of the future.

One of the recent proposals would eliminate survivor benefits for college students over the age of 18. The importance of these benefits has been dramatically and convincingly conveyed to me in a letter from one of my constituents which I would like to share with my colleagues:

FEBRUARY 15, 1979.

Congressman NORM D'AMOURS,
Congressional Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN D'AMOURS: This letter is to urge you to vote against any bill that will eliminate social security benefits to college age students.

My husband was killed piloting an airplane over a year ago. He is no longer able to insure himself for the education of our two daughters. When social security was extended for college age students in the 1960s he dropped an insurance policy he had for that purpose. He thought social security would be adequate. Well, it really is not but without it neither of the girls will continue their education. They both go or will go to the University system because we are unable to afford private college prices. We are not complaining.

I feel it will be a breach of promise on the part of the Government. President Carter and his aides who say that these students qualify for other grants are mistaken. We have been informed by FAF and BEOG that I should be able to contribute enough to send them to the private colleges. I make \$15,000 a year and own my own house, presently valued at \$45,000. I am sure you are aware what happened to the insurance policies since my husband was the pilot of the airplane. How in the world will I be able to make a large mortgage payment and still help the girls and still pay the other bills. I worry that since there are only 110,000 students receiving these benefits, the Senators and Representatives will let it slip by without much dissent. I fear that the American public just does not think about social security until they need it and it is too late. Most of my friends and colleagues do not understand and they are the TEACHERS! So the average person on the street doesn't care or doesn't want to think about it. . . . YET.

As it now stands, my oldest daughter will not be eligible for benefits her senior year. We had her repeat fourth grade nine years ago! She will be too old and as a teacher, I call this downright degrading. We try to convince students there is no stigma in repeating a grade. Seems we are wrong!

Nancy will graduate in June. She is anticipating going to college in the fall. She reads Shakespeare, English Literature, Ann Landers

and the comics. She has no idea that her world is in for another catastrophe. I can't tell her. Would you like to? Please don't let this happen to us!●

THE DEBT CEILING FLIM-FLAM

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of this week, the Democrat administration and the Democrat big spenders in the House, will ask this body to approve another whopping increase in the public debt ceiling. This time \$38 billion which would raise the ceiling from its current level of \$798 billion to \$836 billion. How long will this flim-flam on the American taxpayer continue?

How long will the Democrat big spenders continue to spend this country into the red? How long will the Democrat big spenders continue to turn a callous, deaf ear to the call from the American people to put an end to this traditional and reckless Democrat policy of spend and borrow, and borrow, and spend? Last Thursday, the Republican policy committee went on record as opposing this increase to bail out the Democrat big spenders. I challenge the thoughtful Democrats in this Chamber to join with Republicans on Wednesday and vote down H.R. 1894.

Without objection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the Record the complete text of the Republican policy committee statement on increasing the public debt.

The statement follows:

H.R. 1894—INCREASING THE PUBLIC DEBT

The Democrat big-spenders are at it again. In order to pay for the federal programs which cost more than the federal government receives in revenues the Democrats are pushing the passage of legislation to increase the public debt ceiling from its current level of \$798 billion to \$836 billion.

Over the past four decades, the Democrats who have controlled Congress for 42 out of 46 years have spent our country into the red by more than \$800 billion. The public debt is a national disgrace. Instead of listening to the call of American taxpayers for a reduction in spending and a balanced federal budget, the Carter Administration and the Democrat Majority want to pass H.R. 1894, to finance through borrowing the federal government's bills coming due over the next seven months.

H.R. 1894 raises the public debt limit by \$38 billion through September 30, 1979, authorizes the Department of the Treasury to sell long term securities at interest rates above the statutory ceiling of 4.25 percent, and increases the statutory interest rate ceiling on savings bonds.

This exercise of increasing the public debt is nothing more than a flim-flam of the American taxpayers by the Democrat big-spenders. The Democrats, rather than ear-

nestly trying to balance the budget, continue to vote one deficit budget on top of another deficit budget. Then when the bills come due the Democrat big-spenders demagogue the financial crisis which necessitates increasing the public debt limit and reluctantly vote to increase it. This entire charade becomes an actual fraud on the American people when current Treasury Department estimates show that an additional increase of \$60 billion in public debt will be necessary to meet requirements for fiscal 1980 bringing the total national debt ceiling to \$896 billion.

The American people are calling for a change in the fiscal policies of the federal government. The public groundswell for a balanced budget indicates that the American taxpayer has had it with deficit spending, inflation and gross mismanagement of tax dollars. The congressional budget process and the public debt limit give the Congress the authority to respond and produce a balanced federal budget. Republican efforts to change the direction of existing fiscal policy have been repeatedly turned back by the Democrat Majority in Congress.

This nation is entering the fifth consecutive year of economic growth. The second longest recovery in the post war history. It's time now to begin balancing the federal budget.

The Republican Policy Committee believes that Republicans, who did not vote for the Democrat initiated wasteful spending, should not vote for the increase in the national debt to bail out the Democrat big-spenders. Let the Democrat Majority who got this country into a financial mess provide the votes to increase the public debt. Let those who have danced to the Democrat big-spenders tune now vote to pay the piper.●

LEAA

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, on September 30 of the year, the authorization for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) expires.

While LEAA has many critics, it is far from a failure. It has sponsored many successful programs ranging from projects to strengthen traditional law enforcement, such as the career criminals program, to innovative community anticrime programs.

Recently, Jefferson County (Ky.) Commonwealth Attorney David Armstrong, brought to my attention one particularly successful LEAA program now underway in Jefferson County dealing with white collar crime.

Under this project, an economic crime unit was established and prosecuting as well as preventing economic crimes were given top priority.

With the cooperation and assistance of local police departments, citizens and business community, there has been significant action on economic crime in Jefferson County.

Quoting from Mr. Armstrong's report:

Criminal court cases handled by the special unit involved the theft of some \$1,500,000 from some 700 separate felony crimes. Ninety-one economic criminals were convicted and received prison sentences totalling over 500 years and fines of over \$23,000.00.

Approximately \$257,000.00 was obtained in restitution for some of the 379 victims of white collar crimes involved in cases successfully handled by the Economic Crime Unit. Some \$29,374.00 was voluntarily returned to citizens following the Unit's investigations.

As cosponsor, along with the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, PETER RODINO, a measure to reauthorize and streamline LEAA, I hope my House colleagues will bear in mind successful programs, like the one I have described here, when the time comes to vote on LEAA's future.●

ISRAELI GOVERNMENT DOES NOT SYSTEMATICALLY TORTURE ARAB PRISONERS

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on recent and widely publicized allegations that the Israeli Government systematically tortures Arab prisoners in the occupied territories on the West Bank. Having completed a thorough investigation of the matter, I can only conclude that no such accusation could reasonably be made.

My conclusion agrees with the conclusions reached by the State Department's international human rights report, the U.S. Embassy in Israel, and the International Committee of the Red Cross. The opinion of the Red Cross is probably the most significant. It is a totally independent organization. Its officials are allowed to visit any prisoner no later than the 14th day after the date of arrest, they can have physicians conduct medical examinations, all with no Israeli officials present.

The Red Cross has visited about 1,000 Arab prisoners and has reported mistreatment in only a very few instances—so few that it could in no way be termed "systematic." Edward M. Mezvinsky, the U.S. delegate to the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations, says that Red Cross authorities told him last July that they have found no evidence of "systematic torture of Arab political prisoners."

Reports of systematic torture are based on two cables sent by the U.S. Consulate's office in Israel. In contrast to the massive and totally independent investigations made by the Red Cross, these consulate cables are based on interviews with only 29 Arabs, many of whom may have had political motivations for saying what they did. In any event, the reports were made so long after the Arabs' imprisonment that no physical evidence could verify their claims.

The more famous of the two consulate cables, the one sent by foreign

service officer Alexandra U. Johnson on May 31, reported "the possibility that the use of brutality in the interrogation of Arab political prisoners is a systematic practice, backed up by far-reaching administrative support, and protected by standard methods of suppressing complaints and blocking their investigation."

Mr. Speaker, there are simply no solid facts supporting these assertions.

Nobody, including the official who filed this cable, has ever discovered evidence that Israeli officers are trained in the techniques of torture. Furthermore, we know of several instances in which brutal officers have been dismissed by the Israeli Government. For example, last year the Military Governor of the West Bank was fired for allowing excessive force to be used against Arab prisoners.

I also find it noteworthy that the Israelis do fully cooperate with the International Committee of the Red Cross, something which many governments do not.

The consulate officer based her conclusion of "systematic torture" largely on the finding that the stories of many formerly imprisoned Arabs suggest that similar techniques of torture appeared to have been applied. Even if this were true, I find it flimsy grounds for concluding that the brutality has been "systematic." There are, after all, only so many ways of beating somebody. That two or three people do it fairly similarly does not necessarily indicate a systematic effort.

Certainly, some cases of mistreatment have occurred, just as they occur everywhere in the world, and these instances are regrettable and inexcusable. The key question, however, is whether such practices have been systematic, whether they reflect the policy of the Israel Government. There is simply no convincing evidence that this is the case.●

SIXTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF ESTONIA

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, February 24 marked the 61st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Estonia. I would like to join with my colleagues in commemorating this memorable occasion on behalf of those who are unable to celebrate their own nation's independence.

Estonia has had a history of oppressive rulers, but its people have consistently fought these oppressors. Soon after the proclamation of independence in 1918, Estonia was occupied by the German Army. The World War I armistice ended this period of suppression. However, the Bolshevik army soon attacked the country and was ready to impose the Communist system. The Estonian people fought for their freedom with the help of neighboring countries and they

succeeded. However, the people of Estonia are once again under Communist rule because of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of 1939.

Today Estonia remains under Communist rule. The people face repressive policies that rule not only their country but also their private lives. The consequences are drastic, for even the people's fundamental freedoms are at stake. As a Nation that proclaims freedom is for all, we should be supportive of the Estonian people and their cause for freedom. We commemorate the 61st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Estonia.●

LOCAL GOVERNMENT TAXING AUTHORITY AT NATIONAL AIRPORT

HON. JOSEPH L. FISHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, airports are places of business for airlines, car rental companies, restaurants, newsstands, and many other activities. In most jurisdictions this commercial activity and its customers pay their share of taxes. One would expect that the full range of State and local taxes would be levied at the two commercial airports owned and operated by the Federal Government; however, the taxing authority granted to local governments is different for each of the airports. I am introducing a bill today that would permit Virginia and Arlington County to levy the same taxes at National Airport that Virginia and Fairfax and Loudoun Counties can levy at Dulles International Airport.

The tax status of the two airports varies, because they operate under different Federal legislation. In 1945, Congress and the Virginia General Assembly approved a compact which granted the Federal Government nearly exclusive jurisdiction over National Airport. But unlike other Federal reservations, National Airport is not covered under the Buck Act, which permits State and local governments to tax sales, motor fuels, gross receipts, and the like on Federal property. Congress did give Virginia and Arlington County some taxing power in 1970, primarily to collect State sales tax, for example, but still the power is not as broad as allowed by the Buck Act.

The legislation establishing Dulles International Airport did not include the same restrictions on taxing authority that apply to National. In addition to the taxes permitted under the Buck Act, local jurisdictions in which Dulles is located can and do tax the leasehold interests of the airlines, business licenses, personal property, and business personal property. My bill seeks to grant the same taxing authority over National as was approved by Congress for Dulles.

Of greatest significance is the provision in the bill permitting Arlington County to collect property taxes. Business and personal property and the value of leasehold interests would be subject to this tax. Arlington County loses a sig-

nificant amount of revenue by being denied the right to levy these taxes. A rough guess, extrapolated from the value of property and leasehold interests at Dulles, is that \$200,000 could be collected annually. Since the property at National has never been assessed, no one knows for sure what the tax collections might be.

Arlington County is interested in gaining the authority to levy additional taxes at National Airport for several reasons. The county government incurs expenses because of the airport, without any compensating benefits. For example, the costs of the Metro stop at the airport are charged to Arlington County although generally it serves airplane travelers and is not particularly accessible to Arlington residents. The stop involved a onetime expense of over \$1 million and the annual operating costs for the stop, which are charged to Arlington, are between \$100,000 and \$200,000. County roads and State highways leading to the airport receive heavy use from travelers to the airport. Also, any new construction in Arlington County which may affect radar or flight paths has to be coordinated with airport management. These are examples of costs to the county which can be attributed to the presence of National Airport.

Arlington County and its citizens also bear the indirect but very burdensome cost of the air and noise pollution generated by the airport. Any new tax collections resulting from the bill I am introducing will be fair compensation for costs such as these.

Finally, there is no justification for granting different tax status to activities at the two Federal airports which, in this case, are even located in the same State.

This bill will not result in any additional Federal costs at National Airport. As at Dulles International Airport, or any other Federal reservation, taxes would not be imposed on Federal properties or activities but only on those of private interests doing business there.

I hope that this long overdue equalization of the tax treatment of the two airports can be approved quickly.●

A TRIBUTE TO FRANK HOYE

HON. JAMES M. SHANNON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I must inform my colleagues of the recent death of Francis P. (Frank) Hoyer, a close friend of many Members of the House who retired last February as chief Journal clerk of the House of Representatives.

Frank came to Washington from his home city of Lawrence, Mass., in 1949 after serving his country in the Navy, seeing action in the South Pacific and at Iwo Jima. He was appointed assistant Journal clerk by Congressman Thomas Lane of Massachusetts. Frank was

warned that his job might not last more than 2 years. He took the job, however, and performed his duties so conscientiously that in 1961 he was named chief Journal clerk, a position he held until his retirement. Frank's ultimate honor was to receive the John W. McCormack Annual Award for employee excellence last May.

I was not fortunate enough to serve in Congress while Frank was the Journal clerk. However, I know from the high esteem that my colleagues held him in and from his achievements and service to the House, that Frank exemplified all the qualities that constitute the ideal of a public servant.

My heartfelt condolences go out to Frank's wife Kathryn and his children, Patrick, Ellen, and John.●

THE YEAR 1979 MARKS THE CENTENNIAL OF INCANDESCENT LIGHT

HON. ROBERT MCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, we are celebrating this year the 100th anniversary of the invention of incandescent light by an individual who, more than any other, is identified with the whole modern concept of "light"—Thomas Alva Edison.

An International Committee for the Centennial of Light has been established on which my constituents, Albert B. Dick III, chairman of A. B. Dick Co., and William Ylvisaker, chairman of Gould Corp., are active committee members.

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Alva Edison was born on February 11, 1847. It was in the 32d year of his life that he invented incandescent light on October 21, 1879. Accordingly, it is in recognition of this great invention and its multiple benefits to all mankind that we are celebrating the Centennial of Light throughout 1979—to be culminated on October 21, 1979.

Mr. Speaker, other members of the International Committee for the Centennial of Light include Raymond C. Firestone, Henry Ford II, Reginald H. Jones, and Charles Luce. The committee is chaired by Robert I. Smith, who is chairman of Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Newark, N.J.

Mr. Speaker, by virtue of earlier action of the Congress and by an Executive order of the President of the United States, National Inventors Day is proclaimed annually on February 11 to coincide with the birth date of Thomas Edison. Since 1979 is the 100th anniversary of the invention of incandescent light, it is my hope that other activities and ceremonies may be arranged this year by the Congress and by the executive branch of our Federal Government so that Thomas Edison's great contributions to science and to humanity may be appropriately recognized.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the

aims and plans of the International Committee for the Centennial of Light can have beneficial effects upon the people of our Nation and of the world—particularly the young citizens who can find inspiration in the work and deeds of Thomas Edison. In honoring Thomas Edison on his birthday and celebrating the Centennial of Light during this 100th anniversary of Edison's great invention, we are honoring both the memory of Edison and his scientific and technological achievements which have helped move the modern world toward educational, cultural, and social advances undreamed of a century ago.

In addition, the material and spiritual benefits which have ensued from this great invention, culminating in the various electrical and electronic developments which have followed, provide comforts and advances for which all of our citizens should be grateful.

Mr. Speaker, in paying tribute to Thomas Alva Edison on the 100th anniversary of the invention of incandescent light, I wish also to salute the members of the International Committee for the Centennial of Light on their efforts and activities in behalf of this cause. I wish to assure them as one Member of the House of Representatives—and in behalf of many others for whom I speak today—that we commend them on their activities in behalf of this important centennial event.●

SIXTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF MODERN LITHUANIA

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 61st anniversary of the modern Republic of Lithuania. On behalf of my Lithuanian constituents I would like to join with all Americans in commemorating the anniversary of their nation's Declaration of Independence.

This day of commemoration acknowledges the people of Lithuania who are unable to join with us in celebrating the founding of their nation state. Lithuania, once the largest nation in Europe, has been dominated by oppressive rulers during most of its 728-year history. The Soviet Union is presently dominating the Baltic State with a policy of forced assimilation by forbidding the Lithuanian language. In addition, the peoples' religious and political beliefs are targets of an oppressive policy.

On this anniversary of independence I would like to join with my colleagues in expressing our support to all Lithuanians who have inspired us with their courage and determination in working for a free country. It is our responsibility as a Nation of free people to demonstrate our concern for the oppressed nations of the world and to take an active part in commemorating their independence.●

STATEMENT OF DEINSTITUTIONALIZATION BILLS

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing three bills which are intended, as a package, to improve living conditions for persons released from mental institutions and for the communities in which they reside.

Former mental patients, thousands of whom have been "deinstitutionalized" in recent years under changing Federal and State policies, are often the most vulnerable members of our society. Frequently these individuals are forgotten once they leave institutions and are left to their own inadequate resources. Government at all levels has not provided the comprehensive followup social services which are indispensable for insuring that these former patients can function as independent, productive citizens.

In my own district in New York City, several thousand former patients have been quite literally "dumped" into shoddy single room occupancy (SRO) hotels where they become prey for violent crime and where they are left, alone, to somehow become accepted members of the community.

There is a great deal the Federal Government can do to remedy this shameful situation. The three bills I am introducing address the problem from various perspectives and seek to make better services more readily available to former mental patients.

One bill would amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide medicaid assistance to patients in mental institutions regardless of their age. At present, medicaid eligibility is limited to those patients younger than 22 and older than 65. My legislation would enable patients of all ages to receive comprehensive treatment in institutions under the medicaid program.

A second bill I am introducing would amend title XX of the Social Security Act to increase Federal payments to States for services that will assist former patients in their communities. Among the assistance to be provided them under an expanded title XX program would be sheltered employment, alternative housing, counseling, and therapeutic treatment.

The third bill in the package would amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to eliminate the benefit reduction under the supplemental security income (SSI) program that now occurs when an SSI recipient receives some financial support from other persons with whom he or she is residing. The legislation would also continue SSI payments for 3 months after a person is institutionalized so that the individual's home or apartment could be maintained while they are residing in a public facility. The bill also mandates close monitoring of SSI trial work provisions and clarifies the stipulation that SSI benefits may be paid on the basis of presumptive mental disability as well as presumptive physical disability.

Taken as a package, this legislation will do much to improve living conditions for mental patients in institutions and in the communities to which they are released.

We should be moved, not only by compassion for some of the least fortunate of our fellow Americans, but also by fiscal prudence to encourage former patients to become productive, independent members of our society. These bills will bring us closer to this aim:

H.R.—

A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to eliminate the benefit reduction presently applicable to individuals receiving support and maintenance from families with whom they are living, to continue SSI payments for three-months when a beneficiary is institutionalized, to provide for the monitoring of the SSI trial work period provisions, and to make it clear that SSI benefits (for up to three months) may be paid on the basis of presumptive mental (as well as physical) disability

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SUPPORT AND MAINTENANCE IN ANOTHER PERSON'S HOUSEHOLD

SECTION 1. (a) Clause (1) of section 1612(a)(2)(A) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) in the case of any individual (and his eligible spouse, if any) living in another person's household, support and maintenance received in kind from such person shall not be included."

(b) Clause (iii) of section 1612(a)(2)(A) of such Act is amended by striking out "and the provisions of clause (1) shall not be applicable".

ELIGIBILITY OF INDIVIDUALS IN CERTAIN MEDICAL INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1611(e)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "subparagraph (B) and (C)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D)".

(b) Section 1611(e)(1) of such Act is further amended by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D), and by striking out subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subparagraphs:

"(B) Except as provided in subparagraph (C), in any case where an eligible individual or eligible spouse is in a hospital, extended care facility, nursing home, or intermediate care facility, such individual's benefit for the period ending with the third consecutive month throughout which he is in such hospital, home, or facility shall be determined as though he were continuing to reside outside the institution under the same conditions as before he entered the institution.

"(C) In any case where an eligible individual or eligible spouse, throughout any month, is in a hospital, extended care facility, nursing home, or intermediate care facility, receiving payments (with respect to such individual or spouse) under a State plan approved under title XIX, and such month is either—

"(1) the first month in any period of eligibility under this title based on an application filed in or before such month, or a month in a continuous period of months beginning with such first month, throughout which such individual or spouse is in a hospital, extended care facility, nursing home, or intermediate care facility (whether or not receiving payments with respect to such individual or spouse for each month in such period), or

"(ii) the fourth consecutive month throughout which, or a month in a continuous period beginning with such fourth consecutive month throughout which, such individual or spouse is in a hospital, extended care facility, nursing home, or intermediate care facility (whether or not receiving payments with respect to such individual or spouse for each month in such period), the benefit for such individual for such month shall be payable—

"(iii) in the case of an individual who does not have an eligible spouse, at a rate not in excess of \$300 per year (reduced by the amount of any income of such individual which is not excluded pursuant to section 1612(b));

"(iv) in the case of an individual who has an eligible spouse, if only one of them is in such a hospital, home, or facility throughout such month, at a rate not in excess of the sum of—

"(I) the rate of \$300 per year (reduced by the amount of any income, not excluded pursuant to section 1612(b), of the one who is in such hospital, home, or facility), and

"(II) the applicable rate specified in subsection (b)(1) (reduced by the amount of any income, not excluded pursuant to section 1612(b), of the other); and

"(v) in the case of an individual who has an eligible spouse, if both of them are in such a hospital, home, or facility throughout such month, at a rate not in excess of \$600 per year (reduced by the amount of any income of either spouse which is not excluded pursuant to section 1612(b)); except that for purposes of any provision of law other than this subparagraph, any benefit determined under clause (iv) shall be deemed to be payable at a rate equal to the sum of the rate of \$300 per year and the applicable rate specified in subsection (b)(1), reduced by any income of either spouse which is not excluded pursuant to section 1612(b)".

TRIAL WORK PERIODS

SEC. 3. Section 1614(a)(4) of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(E) The Secretary shall monitor the operation of this paragraph on a continuing basis with particular emphasis upon the extent to which it is giving disabled individuals an effective opportunity to overcome their disabilities and return to active participation in the labor force, and shall take such actions as may be appropriate to make it clear to such individuals that, under the provisions of this paragraph, they can return to work and earn substantial amounts without losing their benefits if their earnings are related to the achievement of self-support."

PAYMENT OF BENEFITS ON BASIS OF PRESUMPTIVE MENTAL DISABILITY

SEC. 4. Section 1631(a)(4)(B) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after "presumptively disabled" the following: "(whether by reason of a physical impairment or a mental impairment)".

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 5. The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to benefits payable for months after the month in which this Act is enacted.

H.R.—

A bill to amend title XX of the Social Security Act to increase Federal payments to States for services which will assist in removing people from institutions, including the provision of alternative housing, sheltered employment, and similar services

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2001(4) of the Social Security Act is

amended by inserting after "less intensive care," the following: "and by providing for alternative housing, sheltered employment, and related items."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2002(a)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after "planning services" in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) the following: ", 90 per centum of the total expenditures during that quarter for the provision of services directed at the goal of preventing or reducing inappropriate institutional care by providing for community-based care, home-based care, or other forms of less intensive care and by providing for alternative housing, sheltered employment, and related items."

(b) Section 2001(a)(1) of such Act is further amended—

(1) by adding "or" after the comma at the end of subparagraph (C);

(2) by striking out subparagraph (D); and

(3) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (D).

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to quarters beginning after September 30, 1978.

H.R. —

A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to make assistance available under the medicaid program for patients in mental institutions without regard to their age (instead of only for those patients in such institutions who are under 22 or over 65 as at present)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 1905(a) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "for individuals 65 years of age or over in an institution for tuberculosis or mental diseases" in paragraph (14) and inserting in lieu thereof "for individuals in an institution for mental diseases (including but not limited to inpatient psychiatric hospital services as defined in subsection (h)) and for individuals 65 years of age or over in an institution for tuberculosis";

(2) by adding "and" after the semicolon at the end of paragraph (15);

(3) by striking out paragraph (16);

(4) by redesignating paragraph (17) as paragraph (16);

(5) by striking out "except as otherwise provided in paragraph (16)" (in the matter following the numbered paragraphs) and inserting in lieu thereof "except as otherwise provided in paragraph (14)"; and

(6) by striking out "or mental diseases" in subdivision (B) (in the matter following the numbered paragraphs).

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1902(a)(10) of the Social Security Act is amended (in the matter which follows subparagraph (C)) by striking out "(4), (14), or (16)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(4) or (14)".

(b) Section 1902(a)(13)(C)(ii)(I) of such Act is amended by striking out "(16)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(15)".

(c) Section 1902(a)(20) of such Act is amended by striking out "65 years of age or older" in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), and in subparagraph (C).

(d) Section 1902(a)(21) of such Act is amended by striking out "65 years of age or older".

(e) (1) Section 1905(c) of such Act is amended by striking out the last sentence.

(2) Section 1905(d) of such Act is repealed.

(f) Section 1905(h)(1) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "paragraph (16) of subsection (a)" in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph (15) of subsection (a)";

(2) by striking out "for individuals under

age 21" in the matter preceding subparagraph (A);

(3) by adding "and" after the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (A);

(4) by striking out "; and" at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

(5) by striking out subparagraph (C).

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to care and services furnished in months after the month in which this Act is enacted. ●

THE CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS RAISED BY LOBBYING DISCLOSURE

HON. THOMAS N. KINDNESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 28, the Subcommittee on Administrative Law and Governmental Relations of the House Judiciary Committee resumes its consideration of proposed lobbying disclosure legislation. The regulation of lobbying, through required public disclosure, presents the Congress with some serious constitutional problems and policy questions. Lobbying—the right to petition—is protected by the first amendment. Any interference with, or infringement upon, this right must receive extremely close legislative scrutiny.

In an effort to point up the various constitutional and policy issues raised by this subject, I have introduced my own version of a "Regulation of Lobbying Act"—H.R. 2302. It differs considerably from other measures which the subcommittee has before it. It contains a simplified "threshold" to determine whether an organization is a lobbyist or not. It would mean far less burdensome reporting and fewer categories of required information than its counterparts. It contains no constitutionally-questionable requirements that grass roots lobbying efforts or contributors be disclosed. The enforcement provisions are clearer, less onerous, and simplified. No criminal penalties would be imposed for the violation of its requirements. The emphasis in enforcement is on the protection of individual rights, conciliation, and the informal settlement of disputes.

For my colleagues' convenience and information, the text of my proposal is as follows:

H.R. 2302

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Regulation of Lobby Act of 1979".

GENERAL DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "affiliate" includes organizations or other groups of persons which are associated with each other through any type of formal relationship, such as through ownership, the election of officers or directors, through franchise agreements, through common funding, or through common adherence to a charter or organizational bylaws.

(2) The term "Comptroller General" means the Comptroller General of the United States.

(3) The term "Congress" means—

(A) any Member of the Senate or the House of Representatives, any Delegate to the House of Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner in the House of Representatives; and

(B) any officer or employee of the Senate or the House of Representatives or any employee of any Member, committee, or officer of the Congress.

(4) The term "expenditure" includes—

(A) a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value made, disbursed, or furnished, and

(B) a promise, contract, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make, disburse, or furnish any item referred to in subparagraph (A).

(5) The term "identification" means—

(A) in the case of an individual, the name, occupation, and business address of the individual and the position held in such business; and

(B) in the case of an organization, the name and address of the organization, the principal place of business of the organization, the nature of its business or activities, and the names of the executive officers and the directors of the organization, regardless of whether such officers or directors are paid.

(6) The term "lobbying communication" means an oral or written communication directed to Congress and which is intended to influence the content or disposition of any bill, resolution, treaty, nomination, hearing, report, or investigation, but does not include—

(A) a communication by an individual for a redress of grievances, or to express his opinion;

(B) a communication by an individual with a Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives, or an individual on the personal staff of such Senator or Member, representing the State where the individual resides;

(C) a communication on behalf of an organization with a Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, or an individual on the personal staff of such Senator or Member, representing the State in which such organization has its principal place of business;

(D) a communication which deals only with the existence or status of any issue, or which seeks only to determine the subject matter of an issue;

(E) a communication made at the request of Congress, or submitted for inclusion in a report of a hearing or in the record or public file of a hearing;

(F) a communication by a Senator, Member of the House of Representatives, officer, or employee of the Congress, acting in his official capacity; or

(G) a communication made through a speech or address, through a newspaper, book, periodical, newsletter, or magazine or other written material published for distribution to the general public or to the membership of an organization, or through a radio or television broadcast.

(7) The term "organization" includes any corporation, company, foundation, association, labor organization, firm, partnership, society, joint stock company, national organization of State or local elected or appointed officials (excluding any national or State political party and any organizational unit thereof, and excluding any association comprised solely of Members of Congress or Congressional employees), groups of organizations, or groups of individuals, which has paid officers, directors, or employees, and with respect to the activities of its Washington representative, a State or unit of local government.

(8) The term "quarterly filing period" means any calendar quarter beginning on January 1, April 1, July 1, or October 1.

(9) The term "State" means any of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(10) The term "Washington representative" means any agent or employee of a State or of a unit of local government who maintains a business address in the standard metropolitan statistical area which includes the city of Washington, District of Columbia, and whose function includes engaging in the activities described in section 3(a).

(11) The term "direct business relationship" means the relationship between an organization and any Senator, Member of the House of Representatives, officer or employee of the Congress, in which—

(A) such Senator, Member, officer or employee is a partner in such organization;

(B) such Senator, Member, officer or employee is a member of the board of directors or similar governing body of such organization; or

(C) such organization and such Senator, Member, officer or employee each hold a legal or beneficial interest (excluding stock holdings in publicly traded corporations, policies of insurance, and commercially reasonable leases made in the ordinary course of business) in the same business or joint venture, and the value of each such interest exceeds \$1,000.

(12) The term "reasonable suspicion" means specific facts and circumstances, which taken together with rational inference from those facts and circumstances, give rise to a strong possibility that specified activity has occurred, is occurring, or is about to occur.

APPLICABILITY OF ACT

SEC. 3. (a) The provisions of this Act shall apply to any organization which makes an expenditure in excess of \$5,000 in any quarterly filing period for the employment of at least one individual, or for the retention of an individual or another organization, to make lobbying communications. Except that the provisions of section 4 and section 6 of this Act shall not apply to an affiliate of a registered organization if such affiliate engages in activities described in this subsection and such activities are reported by the registered organization.

(b) This Act shall not apply to practices or activities regulated by the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

REGISTRATION

SEC. 4. (a) Each organization shall register with the Comptroller General not later than thirty days after engaging in activities described in section 3(a).

(b) The registration shall contain the following, which shall be regarded as material for the purposes of this Act:

(1) An identification of the organization, except that nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require the disclosure of the identity of the members of an organization.

(2) An identification of any employee, retained person, and retained organization in section 3, and a listing of the major issues upon which the organization expects to lobby in the calendar year.

(c) A registration filed under subsection (a) in any calendar year shall be effective until January 15 of the succeeding calendar year. Each organization required to register under subsection (a) shall file a new registration under such subsection within fifteen days after the expiration of the previous registration, unless such organization notifies the Comptroller General, under subsection

(d), with respect to terminating the registration of the organization.

(d) Any registered organization which determines that it will no longer engage in activities described in section 3(a) shall so notify the Comptroller General. Such organization shall submit with such notification either (1) a final report, containing the information specified in section 6(b), concerning any activities described in section 3(a) which the organization has not previously reported or (2) a statement, pursuant to section 6(a)(2), as the case may be. When the Comptroller General receives such notification and report or statement, the registration of such organization shall cease to be effective.

RECORDS

SEC. 5. (a) In accordance with regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General, each organization required to be registered under this Act and each retainee of such organization, shall maintain records relating to the registration and reports required to be filed under this Act. In promulgating regulations, the Comptroller General is authorized to require maintenance of only such records as are essential to enable an organization to comply with the provisions of this Act, and may not by rule or regulation require an organization which is not registered pursuant to this Act to maintain or establish records, other than those records normally maintained by the organization, for the purpose of enabling him to determine whether such organization is required to register.

(b) Any officer, director, employee, or retainee of any organization shall provide to such organization such information as may be necessary to enable such organization to comply with the recordkeeping and reporting requirements of this Act. Any organization which shall rely in good faith on the information provided by any such officer, director, employee, or retainee shall be deemed to have complied with subsection (a) with respect to that information.

(c) The records required by subsection (a) shall be preserved for a period of three years after the close of the quarterly filing period to which such records relate.

REPORTS

SEC. 6. (a) (1) Each organization which engages in the activities described in section 3(a) during a quarterly filing period shall, not later than thirty days after the last day of such period, file a report concerning such activities with the Comptroller General.

(b) Each report required under subsection (a) (1) shall contain the following, which shall be regarded as material for the purposes of this Act:

(1) An identification of the organization filing such reports, and those employees, retained persons, and retained organizations described in section 3(a).

(2) The approximate amount of the total expenditures which such organization made with respect to lobbying communications. An organization may make such statement based either on that portion of the salary of an individual described in section 3(a) directly attributable to lobbying communications or the total salary paid to such individual.

(3) An itemized listing of each expenditure in excess of \$35 made to or for the House of Representatives, officer or employee of the Congress.

(4) A disclosure of those expenditures for any reception, dinner, or other similar event which is paid for, in whole or in part, by the reporting organization and which is held for the benefit of any Senator or Member of the House of Representatives,

regardless of the number of persons invited or in attendance, where the total cost of the event exceeds \$500.

(5) A listing of the issues concerning which the organization filing such report engaged in activities described in section 3(a) and upon which the organization spent a significant amount of its efforts.

(6) A disclosure of each known direct business relationship between the reporting organization and a Senator, Member of the House of Representatives, officer or employee of the Congress, whom such organization has sought to influence during the quarterly filing period involved.

DUTIES OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

SEC. 7. (a) It shall be the duty of the Comptroller General—

(1) to withhold from public disclosure, upon petition by any individual or organization, any information otherwise required to be disclosed to the public pursuant to this Act, upon a showing that disclosure of the information may reasonably be expected to lead to the harassment of any individual or organization or lead to threats or reprisals against any individual or organization;

(2) except in the case of information withheld pursuant to paragraph (1), to make copies of registrations and reports filed with him under this Act available for public inspection and copying, commencing as soon as practicable, but no later than the end of the fifth day following the day of receipt, and permit copying of any such registration or report by hand or by copying machine or, at the request of any person, to furnish a copy of any such registration or report upon payment of a fee which shall be limited to reasonable standard charges for the direct cost of a document search and duplication;

(3) to preserve the originals or accurate reproductions of such registrations and reports for a period of not less than three years from the date on which the registration or report is received; and

(4) to prescribe such procedural rules and regulations, and such forms as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act in an effective and efficient manner.

(b) The duties of the Comptroller General described in subsection (a) (4) of this section shall be carried out in conformity with chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, and any records maintained by the Comptroller General under this Act shall be subject to the provisions of sections 552 and 552a of such chapter.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 8(a) It shall be the duty of the Attorney General to investigate alleged violations of any provision of this Act whenever there is a reasonable suspicion that a violation has occurred. The Attorney General shall expressly authorize in writing each such investigation. Any such investigation shall be conducted expeditiously and with due regard for the rights of privacy of the individual or organization involved.

(b) No investigation under this Act shall commence solely on the basis that an organization is engaged in making lobbying communications.

(c) The Attorney General shall notify the subject of an investigation under subsection (a), unless the Attorney General determines that such notice would interfere with the effective enforcement of this Act.

(d) If the Attorney General determines, after any investigation under subsection (a), that there is reason to believe that any individual or organization has engaged in any act or practice which constitutes a civil violation of this Act as described in section 11(a), he shall endeavor to correct such violation by informal methods of conference or conciliation.

(e) If the informal methods described in subsection (d) fail, the Attorney General may institute a civil action, including an action for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or any other appropriate relief, in the United States district court for the judicial district in which such individual or organization is found, resides, or transacts business.

(f) The United States district courts shall have jurisdiction of actions brought under this Act.

REPORTS BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

SEC. 9. The Comptroller General shall transmit reports to the President of the United States and to each House of the Congress no later than March 31 of each year. Each such report shall contain a detailed statement with respect to the activities of the Comptroller General in carrying out his duties and functions under this Act, together with recommendations for such legislative or other action as the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF RULES OR REGULATIONS

SEC. 10. (a) Upon promulgation of any rule or regulation to carry out the provisions of section 4, 5, or 6 under the authority given him in section 7(a) (4) of this Act, the Comptroller General shall transmit notice of such rule or regulation to the Congress. The Comptroller General may place such rule or regulation in effect as proposed at any time after the expiration of ninety calendar days of continuous session after the date on which such notice is transmitted to the Congress unless, before the expiration of such ninety days, either House of the Congress adopts a resolution disapproving such rule or regulation.

(b) For purposes of this section—

(1) continuity of session of the Congress is broken only by an adjournment sine die; and

(2) the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain shall be excluded in the computation of the ninety calendar days referred to in subsection (a).

SANCTIONS

SEC. 11(a). Any individual or organization who with specific intent violates section 4, 5, or 6 of this Act shall be fined not more than \$5,000 for each such violation not to exceed \$100,000.

(b) Any individual or organization selling or utilizing information contained in any registration or report in violation of section 7(a) (1) of this Act shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than \$100,000.

EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS

SEC. 12. An organization shall not be denied an exemption or have an existing exemption revoked under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as an organization described in section 501(c) of such Code, and shall not be denied status as an organization described in section 170(c) (2), 2055 (a) (2), 2106(a) (2) and 2522 of such code, solely on the basis of information disclosed under this Act.

REPEAL OF THE FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

SEC. 13. The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act (2 U.S.C. 261 et seq.), and that part of the table of contents of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 which pertains to Title III thereof, are repealed.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 14. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof, is held invalid, the

validity of the remainder of this Act and the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 15. There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act \$1,600,000 for the fiscal year beginning on October 1, 1980; \$1,600,000 for the fiscal year beginning on October 1, 1981, and, \$1,600,000 for the fiscal year beginning on October 1, 1982.

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 16(a). Except as provided in subsection (b), the provisions of this Act shall take effect on October 1, 1980.

(b) Sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 11, shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the date on which the first rules and regulations promulgated to carry out the provisions of sections 4, 5, and 6 take effect, in accordance with sections 7 and 10.

PRESIDENT URGED TO ADOPT SUBURBAN POLICY

HON. RONALD M. MOTT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I insert in today's RECORD a copy of a letter written to President Carter by the House Suburban Caucus.

The caucus is urging the President to adopt a suburban policy to go along with his urban and rural policies. The problems affecting suburban residents, who pay most of the income taxes in this country, are unique and cannot be dealt with by an urban or rural policy.

We recognize that there is a valid need for urban and rural policies, but the 60-member caucus feels there is also a great need for a separate policy to address the problems of suburbia.

The caucus will continue to press for a separate suburban policy to meet the needs of millions of neglected Americans in the suburbs.

The letter follows:

THE SUBURBAN CAUCUS,
February 22, 1979.

HON. JIMMY CARTER,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As co-chairman of the Congressional Suburban Caucus, we would again like to request a meeting between yourself and representatives from our group. We would further suggest that such a meeting be scheduled as soon as possible in order that we are able to discuss the Administration's legislative program for the 96th Congress as it relates to the domestic issues confronting the nation.

We would also like to reiterate our earlier concern that federal policy-makers consider the impact on suburban areas before your legislative and regulatory proposals are submitted to the Congress. It is our firmly held belief that such consideration has not been adequately given in the past. The beginning of the 96th Congress offers an opportunity for change. We look forward to discussing such important domestic matters as countercyclical aid, revenue sharing, housing and

community development, and tax matters affecting suburbia with you at an early date. Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. WYDLER,
RONALD M. MOTT,
Co-Chairmen.●

FINANCING METRO RAIL CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION

HON. JOSEPH L. FISHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, before the first shovel of earth was turned in 1969 to begin construction of the Metro subway, many people in the Washington region thought the subway would never be built. Ten years later, with 34 stations and 30.8 miles of track open, serving 215,000 passengers a day, many find it unthinkable that the subway should not be completed. The Washington metropolitan region is proud of its accomplishment in getting Metro this far along. Funds for construction of 60 percent of the system are assured. After extensive study, the local governments in the area have reaffirmed their support for the balance of the system. These are important accomplishments but much more remains to be done. New financing arrangements will have to be approved to meet the remaining construction costs which primarily because of the extreme inflation in those costs during recent years, now appear to be more than twice as high as originally estimated. Beyond this, policies have to be established for covering the costs of operating and maintaining the total bus and rail system.

CONSTRUCTION COSTS

The principal task for the short term is to secure financing for the remaining construction. Over \$1.2 billion for construction is available for transfers to Metro from discontinued highway projects. This will have to be matched by about \$200 million in State and local funds at the new, more favorable matching ratio for the so-called "interstate transfer" money included in the 1978 Surface Transportation Act which increased the Federal share from 80 percent to 85 percent. In addition to the interstate transfers already earmarked, Metro will need about \$1.7 million in Federal contributions plus contributions from the governments in the region. Finally, to complete the construction financing, the Federal Government and the local governments will have to agree on how to repay revenue bonds which were sold to finance part of the early stages of Metro construction.

A Metro financing bill (H.R. 1791) of which I am a cosponsor, has been introduced which will authorize the necessary funds. The bill reaffirms the commitment of the Federal Government to a transportation system in the Washington region and to a special role in supporting the system. It authorizes \$1.7 billion (80 percent) in Federal funds, to be matched by \$425 million (20 percent)

of State and local funds. Continuing the involvement of the Federal Government in planning and building Metro which dates back to the 1950's and using the matching fund requirements of other Federal transportation legislation, this bill should provide the resources to finish the job.

The early financing of Metro was accomplished partially through the sale of \$1 billion in revenue bonds. The Secretary of Transportation has indicated that the Federal Government would repay two-thirds of the principal and interest on the bonds. The local governments will be responsible for the remaining one-third. The new financing bill will codify the agreement on these bonds and also permit flexibility in the payment schedule. Because the revenue from the bonds was used in the early years of the project when the Federal Government was contributing only two-thirds of the cost the repayment of the bonds can logically be set at that ratio. New capital contributions will have an 80 percent Federal share.

OPERATING COSTS

Consideration of the financing of Metro is incomplete without dealing with future operating costs. No public transit system in the country is able to pay its costs from fare revenue alone. Metro needs a definite policy setting forth what share is to come from riders and what share from Government sources. Metro now collects slightly over 50 percent of its costs through fares, some other cities collect more and some less. To make certain that riders continue to bear a fair share of the costs, whatever they may be in the future, the Metro board should seriously consider adopting a fare policy which sets a percentage of operating costs to be covered by fares. Fares should then be revised periodically to maintain that level, which might fall somewhere in the one-half to three-quarters range.

The remainder of the operating costs not paid by fares must be subsidized by Government. The Federal Government contributes to meeting operating costs of transit systems elsewhere in the country, through funds authorized by the Urban Mass Transportation Act. It should perhaps contribute additional amounts to Metro because it plays a special national role in this region. But the larger share of the operating subsidy will have to continue to come from State and local governments. A fare policy, as suggested earlier, will make it easier for these governments to forecast their financial requirements. The shares from the State and local governments respectively will no doubt be worked out differently in Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia. Local jurisdictions may want to subsidize certain categories of riders such as the elderly, students, and low-income persons.

In Virginia the State should assume some portion of this burden, but the local counties and cities will have to carry most of the load. The local governments should also have a predictable, steady source of revenue to meet their obligation. The ideal solution would be a regionwide tax of some sort, but short of that, each major jurisdiction should be

able to impose a special tax, the revenue from which is dedicated to Metro. Such a tax would help assure payment of operating costs and would take pressure off the property tax which already is at a high level and must support many other services. It would also give local governments flexibility and control over their financial affairs. In Virginia, one possible alternative would be for the State legislature to authorize an additional penny on the sales tax in northern Virginia jurisdictions participating in Metro.

CONCLUSION

The Metro system has emerged from a difficult period during which alternatives to the unbuilt segments were studied and new financial plans considered. Metro has survived these stresses; the local governments have reaffirmed their commitment to building the rail system. The result is a somewhat delicate set of agreements, each dependent on the other. The local governments have agreed to certain features of the plan in anticipation of certain actions by the Federal Government. The Federal Government, in turn, is willing to do its part only if the State and local governments take certain actions. For the whole to hold together, all parties must trust each other and move ahead with the steps required of them. The Metro financing bill (H.R. 1792) should be enacted by Congress; the State government, certainly Virginia, should ultimately permit a regional dedicated tax; the local governments should provide for their share of needed funds by sponsoring any bond issues required; and the Metro board should agree on a long-term fare policy. I urge my colleagues in the Congress and throughout the region to forge ahead on these important tasks. ●

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO), for yielding. I particularly thank him for taking this time so that we might recognize the aspirations of these fine people.

I think it is fair to say for the RECORD that the problem does not come so much from what the intentions and aspirations of the Lithuanian people are. We know they have a resolve to be free; we know they have an unquenchable thirst for freedom that has never abated.

Maybe some of the problem comes from some of us in this country in not holding out enough hope to those oppressed people that someday they will be free. I know that one of the original concepts of the Catholic Lithuanian Declaration of Independence was that this country would hold out to the oppressed peoples of the world, whoever they might be, the hope that they would ultimately live in a world of freedom, and over the years I think we have worked toward that goal.

However, we no longer talk about oppressions, but we talk about the just aspirations of people. I think maybe we in this country and we as part of this special order should not only hail the Lithuanian people for their spirit but look inwardly to ourselves and see whether or not we do hold the candle and the torch, as it were, as a means of giving them the hope that someday they will be free.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleagues for taking this time to commemorate the 61st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Lithuanian people on this occasion.

BLOOD BANK OF HAWAII

HON. CECIL (CEC) HEFTTEL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. HEFTTEL. Mr. Speaker, I recently came across an interesting article in a magazine entitled "Ampersand," published by the Alexander and Baldwin Co. of Hawaii, which I am delighted to share with my colleagues. The blood bank of Hawaii serves not only as an example of Hawaii's unique problems, being an island State of at least 4½ hours away from the mainland, but also of community awareness and responsibility. The blood bank is indeed a source of pride among Hawaii's citizens as it has developed, through community support and participation, into a sophisticated organization, comparable to many well-run blood banks in the country.

BLOOD BANK OF HAWAII

It is an ordinary day in Hawaii, mostly pleasant and peaceful, but with some unsettling situations.

There's been a car accident and three people are injured.

Several people are undergoing surgery, some open heart, at Honolulu hospitals.

Two infants struggle for survival.

Cancer patients begin another round of treatments.

And, at least one poor soul has bleeding ulcers.

Keeping a close and experienced eye on all of this—as it has done for nearly 40 years—is the Blood Bank of Hawaii.

For the people involved in these situations—although they don't know each other and hardly are in a position to give it a thought—share something in common.

On this ordinary day in Hawaii, they all need blood to stay alive.

And, they will get it, along with others who need it, thanks to the Blood Bank of Hawaii.

The situations described above, multiplied several times, are common occurrences to the Blood Bank. Providing this needed blood is considered meeting "normal requirements." Hawaii requires approximately 2,500 pints (units) of blood a month, just to cover everyday situations. To meet this requirement, the Blood Bank draws (collects) from volunteer donors some 100 pints of blood a day, six days a week.

The Blood Bank also is geared for emergencies—an eight-car accident, for example, in which victims are in trauma, or some other catastrophe. It must supply the blood for such emergencies while continuing to fulfill the State's normal requirements.

In nearly four decades, using various

methods including public appeal, the Blood Bank has done exactly that. In good times and bad, the organization has not let Hawaii down.

Although the Blood Bank is run as a successful business, it is a nonprofit organization whose only objective is to supply Hawaii with blood 365 days a year.

The Blood Bank collects blood from donors throughout the State, processes the blood in its own laboratory, and then distributes it to hospitals to be used in direct patient transfusions. It operates much like a money bank, except that units of blood are the medium of exchange. As it moves blood about and makes "investments," the Blood Bank protects the public against future needs. In doing so, it performs a vital community service.

For the Islands' civilian population, it is the sole collector of and repository for blood. Tripler Medical Center has a similar operation for the military, and these two organizations cooperate to meet all Hawaii's needs.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT

Since 1973 the Blood Bank has received blood on a volunteer basis, and all units are labeled "collected from volunteer donor."

But long before that when different methods were used to get blood—including paying donors—the Blood Bank had captured public interest. Today it enjoys tremendous community loyalty and support.

Evidence of this is found in the 90,000 people who participate in Blood Bank programs.

The Blood Bank and the community are interdependent. Without support and community participation, the Blood Bank could not exist. Without the Blood Bank, Hawaii would be in a dreadful mess. How could the individual hospitals meet all their blood requirements, much less do this as quickly and efficiently as the Blood Bank? What would happen to this isolated island state without its orderly and daily blood supply close at hand? Imagine the chaos in an emergency.

Says Dr. Julia Frohlich, executive director of the Blood Bank of Hawaii. "The community approach is the key to the success of the Blood Bank of Hawaii. Some people might ask, 'Can't we just fly the blood in when we need it?' Technically we could. But imagine the time lost, and the cost to do this. And, who suffers in the end? The patients needing the blood transfusions, which could be any one of us here in Hawaii."

With community responsibility in mind, she adds: "Why should another community on the mainland supply Hawaii's blood needs, in addition to its own? Why shouldn't Hawaii take care of its own needs? The people of Hawaii apparently believe it is their responsibility for they respond well to the Blood Bank appeals and programs. And, this is the most rewarding aspect of our work—the wonderful relationship we have with the community."

But, good as Hawaii has been, every community needs to be spurred on. The one doing this in Hawaii for many years has been Betsy Mitchell, community relations and donor recruitment director at the Blood Bank.

Known throughout the Islands as the Blood Lady, Mitchell's career and personal commitment is to "make sure all our needs are met every single day without wasting a single drop of blood."

This immensely dedicated woman, the most familiar name in local Blood Bank work, will be examined more closely in an accompanying article. As this is written she is busily seeing to it that enough blood is collected, guided by the philosophy: "Donors are the greatest people who ever lived—if only they get involved. You must reach them, get to them, tell them the Blood Bank story."

BLOOD IS UNIQUE

There is no doubt that Hawaii's cooperation is based partly on people's healthy respect for this unique, essential element called blood that has yet to be duplicated and that always is in demand.

For people need blood all the time. A lucky few may live a lifetime without requiring a blood transfusion. But most will need blood at least once in their lives. And there are so many who require blood frequently and in large amounts.

The need for blood transcends all boundaries for it makes no distinction as to race, color, creed, age, sex, religious preference or economic status.

And blood links all humanity for it is supplied to human beings only by other humans.

Explains Dr. Frohlich: "Blood cannot be synthetically reproduced, nor have we found a substitute for it. Humans cannot use animal blood. And, although other countries have experimented with blood from the dead or dying, in the United States we use blood only from living, healthy people."

Hawaii's people keep their Blood Bank well stocked for various reasons. The motive may be personal and purely selfish—"I might need blood someday." It might be genuine compassion—"A friend of mine needs it," or "I'd like to think I've helped someone." Or the reason might be practical and businesslike: "There has to be an adequate blood supply in the community and it's good sense and good business for me to donate." Whatever the motive—and all are perfectly legitimate—the results are impressive.

In addition, donating blood can save people money. The Blood Bank of Hawaii offers plans (discussed in more detail later) whereby donors do not pay a cent for blood when they or their families need it. Like everything else in health care, blood is expensive, and one of the Blood Bank's major goals is to keep costs down.

As a new year opens, the Blood Bank of Hawaii is ready to enter an exciting new era. For one thing, it awaits important national recognition. For another, it prepares to build and then move into a modern, new facility . . . actually its first real home. And, in still another area, some major changes are being made in its plans which should benefit the people of Hawaii.

REGIONAL CENTER

According to Dr. Frohlich, 25 percent of the blood centers in the United States operate in the same manner as the Blood Bank of Hawaii—as nonprofit, community organizations. Fifty percent are Red Cross centers. The other 25 percent are blood centers in hospitals, and these usually are found in the big cities.

The Blood Bank of Hawaii is momentarily awaiting recognition by the American Blood Commission as a regional blood center. This is prestigious recognition for it means that the Blood Bank is meeting important national goals set by the commission. These goals include insuring an adequate supply of blood in the area it serves, providing the highest quality of blood for patient transfusions, offering access to blood and blood products to all in need regardless of economic status, and doing its work efficiently as it collects, processes, stores and distributes blood.

The Blood Bank has been inspected and licensed since 1960 by the bureau of Biologics of the Food and Drug Administration—some 22 years before such inspection became mandatory in the United States.

The Blood Bank is a member of the American Association of Blood Banks which annually inspects and accredits facilities and a founding member of the Council of Community Blood Centers, a national organization whose members share similar goals and structure.

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

Perhaps least known about the Blood Bank is its role as a respected scientific organization engaged in important research and education.

Although its primary function is to collect, process and distribute blood for patient transfusions, the Blood Bank also serves as a center for consultation regarding drug testing and the use of blood and its components. Among its facilities is a reference laboratory, in which the Blood Bank does "detective work" on type, matching, antibodies and other aspects of blood study for hospitals throughout the State.

The Blood Bank provides many educational services to medical personnel throughout the State, and participants in research programs in Hawaii and on the mainland. Resources and services of the Blood Bank are available to all patients and physicians throughout Hawaii with whom the organization enjoys a warm and cordial relationship.

HISTORY OF CARING

The Blood Bank of Hawaii was founded in February 1941 with funds from the public health committee of the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce. From December 7, 1941, the day the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, until October 1943, the Blood Bank functioned as a wartime agency under the Office of Civilian Defense, Department of the Interior.

It returned to its nonprofit civilian community status on October 26, 1943 when it received a charter from the Territorial treasurer.

One of the Blood Bank's founders was Dr. Forrest J. Pinkerton, an eye, ear, nose and throat specialist, and the father of Betsy Mitchell. The difficulties in getting donors during the pre-war days left its mark on Dr. Pinkerton, a community-minded man. It was he who guided the organization on the path to what it is today. Dr. Pinkerton served as a director of and was active in the Blood Bank until his death in 1974.

Throughout its history, the Blood Bank has offered several plans and used various recruiting tools to insure its blood supply. These included a Group Reserve Plan with blood credits for donors, lifetime individual membership plan, replacement program in which people replaced the blood they used by donating blood or paying a fee and cash membership plan. The Blood Bank also paid donors.

In 1960, the Blood Bank dropped its lifetime membership plan and established an annually renewable Blood Service Donor Plan. The plan offers donors complete coverage for a year and contributes to a more regular and predictable blood supply.

Incidentally, up until the late 1960's, military personnel contributed significantly and regularly to the Blood Bank.

In 1973, the Blood Bank stopped paying donors. Relying solely on volunteer donors, the organization made heavy public appeals, particularly on radio.

LIFESAVERS

A dramatic turn of events on November 13, 1975 led to the establishment of the Lifesavers Club, the Blood Bank's most effective group membership plan to date. That was one of the only two days in the Blood Bank's 38 years of service, that its blood supply did not fully meet community needs.

On that day the blood supply in Hawaii was so low that all elective surgery was cancelled. Again appeals went out for blood through radio, television and newspapers.

It was the day Betsy Mitchell required surgery and needed type A blood, which is fairly common. There was not enough for her. But Hawaii would not let its Blood Lady down, and radio appeals brought in dozens of donors. Mitchell was aware of all of this. As she went into surgery, she vowed to work

on a program to make sure this dangerous situation never again would exist in Hawaii.

From that program, which was established with Blood Bank directors Edwin S. N. Wong, John Hensen, John Field and Russell Okara, emerged the highly successful Lifesavers Club based entirely on group participation. Any company can join the Lifesavers Club if 20 percent or more of its employees donate blood. Presently more than 400 companies participate. And the plan is renewable every year.

In Hawaii blood costs \$45 a pint. Lifesavers Club members can save this cost for themselves and their families. Those who cannot donate may pay a participation fee of \$10—again, providing 20 percent of their company employees participate as donors.

CHANGE IN PLANS

Beginning January 1, all plans and incentives are being dropped except the Lifesavers Club and the Blood Service Donor Plan for the self employed and those who are not Lifesavers. The Blood Bank has found that its other plans and incentives did not noticeably increase the supply of blood, were frequently confusing to the public and not entirely in line with national standards.

The Blood Bank also had divided its blood costs into \$15 for the blood itself and \$30 for a processing fee. As of January 1, blood will still cost \$45 but any reference to a replacement or blood fee will be dropped.

And blood insurance plans for cash also will be dropped.

Explains Dr. Frohlich "What we really excel at is blood—not money. Our membership plans in the past have made us a primary insurer for blood payments. But beginning January 1, as a result of our changes, our membership plans will take a secondary role and the primary insurers will rightfully be the various health plans which provide coverage for blood service anyway. Our plans will provide only those benefits not covered by patients' insurance plans. In this way there is no double coverage, we can help to contain costs in health care, and the community is less confused. We are a blood provider—not an insurance company."

Just as its plans regularly are updated, so the Blood Bank in recent years has undergone changes in structure and approach. Today, it is run as a tight business, similar in makeup to the companies from whom it derives so much support.

The Blood Bank consists of a policy-making board of directors which includes 22 people from the community who give their time and talents on a voluntary basis; an executive director (Dr. Frohlich), who is responsible for the overall management and operation and who also is a member of the board and four departments with a total of 65 employees—administration, donor recruitment, nursing and laboratory.

A self supporting, financially sound organization, the Blood Bank receives no outside funds for its operation, although it does seek public support for its building program.

"We operate with funds generated by the fees charged for blood products," explains Dr. Frohlich. "In other words, we collect money from the sale of our blood products and this income runs the Blood Bank. It pays our salaries and rent and buys our equipment. Incidentally, we use a cooperative inventory approach with the hospitals, and we only charge for the blood that is used."

MANY USES OF BLOOD

Fortunately blood has multiple uses, in whole or part. Blood processing, which is done at the Blood Bank laboratory, consists of separating units of whole blood—with centrifugal machines—into their various parts or components so that more than one person may benefit from a single unit or pint. All blood components are kept and stored in separate plastic bags.

Whole blood is used in cases when large volumes of blood are needed in a hurry, such as for open-heart surgery or accidents. Blood can be broken down into three or four components including red blood cells which is the component most frequently used in transfusions; platelet concentrate for cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy, fresh frozen plasma for coagulation problems; and anti-hemophilic factor for victims of hemophilia.

Whole blood and its components have varying, but relatively short lifespans. Whole blood and red blood cells must be transfused in 21 days, and platelets in 72 hours. Fresh frozen plasma and anti-hemophilic factor have a one-year lifespan.

Dr. Frohlich says a new substance which would increase the life of whole blood and red blood cells to 35 days will be available in June 1979. Meanwhile the Blood Bank lab last year got a new cell washer which prepares special units containing only red blood cells. White blood cells, platelets and plasma are completely removed. These washed units of red blood cells are given to patients who may require multiple transfusions over long periods of time.

In view of all of this, it is understandable that while the Blood Bank can't afford to be out of blood, neither can it be oversupplied. A look at the laboratory's refrigerators shows a carefully monitored supply. And, the Blood Bank regularly transfers components not only from its own laboratory, but between hospitals as various needs arise. It also has a supply of rare blood which it distributes to hospitals as needed.

PLANNING IS IMPORTANT

Blood is collected at the donor center on Dillingham Boulevard, and through blood-mobiles which are assigned to different locations on Oahu four days a week. Neighbor Islands also have bloodmobiles and centers for regular, scheduled donations.

The experienced Blood Bank staff knows almost exactly how much blood it can count on from the center and mobiles each day. They also know that 20 percent who show up will not be able to donate for one reason or another, so they count on only 80 percent of the scheduled donors to actually give blood.

It is essential, reminds Mitchell, that companies schedule their employee donors five days in advance for the mobiles. They also should advise the Blood Bank exactly who will be donating. In this way, the Blood Bank can figure what types of blood will come in and schedule their use.

Of necessity, the Blood Bank follows a strict daily routine. Every day as soon as its doors open at 8 a.m., the Blood Bank is advised by all hospitals as to what they have on hand, what is cross-matched (assigned to patients) and what the expected needs are for the day—both planned situations such as surgery and unexpected happenings.

Armed with this information, the Blood Bank checks its refrigerators and then its mobile schedule. It then figures out what can be expected from the donor center. And barring a catastrophe, Hawaii is routinely, but well supplied with blood.

And now the Blood Bank has a bold new plan for emergencies built around volunteer "rescue companies" whose employees can be rounded up in a hurry and from all points in Oahu to donate blood and meet such needs.

NEW HOME

In 1977, when The Queen's Medical Center continued its expansion plans, the building and facilities of the Blood Bank—located there for many years—had to be relocated. The temporary solution was to divide the operation at two sites, with administrative and laboratory functions in the Gold Bond Building on Ala Moana and the donor center on Dillingham Boulevard.

But by 1980, the Blood Bank will have a spacious new home of its own for the first time. Plans are under way to construct a two-story, \$900,000 center on 35,000 square feet of leased land adjacent to the donor center on Dillingham. Construction is expected to start in September 1979, but the donor center will continue regular operation.

The new facility will have 13,000 square feet of space and parking for 40 cars. The first floor will be used as a donor center and for supplies and mobile equipment. The second floor will house the laboratory, offices, donor recruitment area, blood inventory equipment, reference lab and two new sections—a blood freezing department (new in Hawaii) and a conference room.

The new building will greatly increase the Blood Bank's efficiency by centralizing all its operations. It will be close to the airport, so that blood can be delivered quickly and easily to Neighbor Islands. In short, it will restore all functions to a full service center—collecting, testing and processing.

Beginning in April 1979, the Blood Bank will appeal to the public for funds to build this new facility. Although it always has asked for blood, the organization has never gone to the community for money before. But, it hopes that the people of Hawaii will want to share in this important new construction.

Although the fund-raising campaign has not yet begun, anyone can start sending donations to the Building Fund, Blood-Bank of Hawaii, Gold Bond Building, Ala Moana.

The Blood Bank of Hawaii has developed into a sophisticated organization that stands tall with others throughout the country. And, it adds a spirit of aloha to efficient business practices. Now, more than ever, the Blood Bank deserves all the support it can get from the community it serves so well. ●

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently we observed the 61st anniversary of the proclamation of the independence by the Republic of Estonia.

The people of Estonia labored long and hard to achieve national identity only to have the Soviet Army march in to impose a Communist government in 1940.

This military occupation of Estonia and in the other Baltic States of Latvia and Lithuania has brought much hardship to these people. There have been arrests, deportations, executions as well as abridgement of all basic human rights.

The plight of nations like Estonia, which are non-Russian yet under Soviet domination, does not often receive attention in the public outcry for human rights. But we in the Congress must no longer neglect the right for all to live independent and free.

At a time when human rights is a cornerstone of our foreign policy, I believe we must have the courage and conviction to speak out against the suppression of Estonian culture and history.

We must make it clear that America stands by her tradition of freedom and strongly supports Estonia and other nations in their quests for freedom. ●

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL'S
RESPONSE TO CRITICS

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for an organization to be active in helping promote respect for basic human rights and not be attacked for having some special ax to grind. One such organization is Amnesty International, which rose to international prominence upon receiving the 1977 Nobel Peace Prize. It is interesting to note that periodically Amnesty is charged with being biased in one way or another; but seldom is it charged that Amnesty is inaccurate.

Recently a piece appeared in the winter 1979 edition of *Matchbox* (a quarterly publication of the U.S. section of Amnesty International) which responds to concerns about the group's impartiality as well as sets forth the fundamental principles and methods that guide AI's work. The author is Mr. Andrew Blane, who is a member of Amnesty's international executive committee and associate professor of history at CCNY (Lehman College).

I ask that the accompanying excerpt of this article be printed in the RECORD at this time as an articulate explanation of how Amnesty sees its role.

THE INDIVIDUAL IN THE CELL—A REBUTTAL TO
"POLITICS AND AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL"

In March 1978 *Commentary* magazine published an article by Stephen Miller titled "Politics and Amnesty International." Interest in it has apparently been widespread. In the United States it has been entered into the Congressional Record by a U.S. Congressman and reprinted by the *Conservative Digest* under the heading "Amnesty International—Is it Left Wing?" The article has also evoked comment abroad, judging from the queries received by Amnesty International groups in Australia, Great Britain, Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden and Switzerland. At least one government official has taken active notice: the Ambassador of the South African Embassy in Washington has distributed copies of the article with his replies to correspondence about human rights violations reported in his country. A formal response by Amnesty International is therefore now necessary.

Does the article deserve such widespread attention? Hardly. It is clear the author knows little about Amnesty International. Ninety percent of the general argument is based on a single publication whose contents summarize the work of AI in a single year: 1977. Consequently, the article is at best a book review. It is not, as it purports to be, an analysis of a change in orientation of a movement which in 1977, after sixteen years of existence, had come to embrace 168,000 members and supporters in 107 countries. Nor is the article a good book review. Not one of the arguments put forward can withstand close scrutiny.

"The increasingly indiscriminate attitude AI has been taking toward the question of what constitutes a violation of human rights," he writes, "has resulted . . . in the emergence in its literature of a strange picture of the landscape of injustice." When examined in the light of the expressed limits of AI's literature, this assertion is false and the examples irrelevant. The larger portion of contemporary injustice does

not find reflection in Amnesty's literature because it falls outside AI's mandated concerns. Moreover, even within these narrow confines only a part of the world's injustices gets recorded because of an insufficiency of resources to undertake comprehensive research on every country. This limited scope of AI's reports is, in fact, carefully noted in the introductory paragraph to the 1977 annual report. Consequently, to imply that this report in any fashion offers a "picture of the landscape of injustice" is misleading.

To then say on the basis of two paragraphs devoted to Switzerland and one to North Korea that AI's literature offers a strange picture of injustice is nonsense. It is no less ridiculous to contrast the number of prisoners AI reported under adoption in 1977 in the USA and Cuba and to suggest that this too exemplifies the strange picture of the landscape of injustice in AI's literature. The facts belie this notion: 1) The adoption of prisoners is the heart of AI's organization. 2) AI's resources are rarely sufficient to adopt all known political prisoners in a country. 3) AI has a cardinal rule that no prisoner should be adopted for whom this would entail risk. In 1977, AI had no adopted prisoners in Uganda. Does that mean that AI considered Uganda to be a just country? 4) AI has a cardinal rule that no prisoner should be adopted against his or her wishes. Should AI violate these wishes to serve some abstract landscape of injustice drawn by a body-count of adopted prisoners? To put it simply, AI is not organized to paint landscapes of injustice, however tempting that might be, but to free prisoners of conscience, halt torture, stop executions, and it is these concerns that are reflected in its reports.

"AI is stuck with the news it can get, and"—continues the article—"it usually finds it easier to get news from countries that have rightist, authoritarian regimes—not to speak of countries that are democratic—than from countries whose governments are leftist and totalitarian." On the whole this assertion is not troubling, but what is derived from it is. "The consequence is that in AI's latest annual report, the same number of pages (four and a half) is devoted to Singapore as is devoted to China. Four pages are devoted to human rights violations in West Germany, only two to East Germany; three pages to Chile, only two to Cuba; four to South Korea, only two to Cambodia."

This conclusion fails to take into account a number of facts. First, the reports on individual countries which appear in AI's annual report are only part of what AI publishes in any given year. In 1977, individual reports were published on 19 countries. Second, AI may be "stuck with the news it can get," as Mr. Miller puts it, but the organization is by no means passive about this circumstance, ever seeking to enlarge its sources of information. In 1977, for example, no country was given more attention in terms of AI research capacity than China. Third, only rarely does the availability of information affect the length of the country reports in AI's annual report. In 1977, none of the eight countries he cites was so affected. Fourth, Stephen Miller has selected and paired countries on entirely arbitrary grounds. He could have, by another juggling of countries, made a stronger case, or a reverse case, or a wholly different case. With 117 countries to pick from in AI's 1977 annual report, the combinations possible in this "number game"—as well as the ends to which they can be twisted—are many indeed. Fifth, substance rather than length is the fundamental criterion by which to judge AI's literature. If AI's annual report takes two paragraphs to summarize a trial in a country to which it has sent an observer and one paragraph to describe a massacre in another country which it has learned about through intermediaries, by what strange inversion can it be said that two-versus-one paragraphs convey more than

the words "trial observation" and "massacre" and that AI is thereby distorting the human rights reality in the two countries? . . .

The great variety of repressive techniques and the impact of these techniques on victims is why Amnesty International sticks strictly to its country-by-country reporting, without presuming to make comparisons. As stated in its 1977 annual report: "In some countries regimes allow para-military groups to kidnap, torture and assassinate political activists; in others prisoners are kept in detention for years without trial. In some police stations torture is carried out with electric shocks; in others with psychological methods. In some prisons the inmates are refused all communication with their families; in others they are starved. There is absolutely no point in trying to judge which measures are categorically 'better' or 'worse' than others. Similarly, it would be a misleading exercise to grade or rank regimes. In the end, what matters is the pain and suffering the individual endures in the police station or in the cell." The individual in the cell—this is the fundamental orientation from which AI seeks to govern all its deeds and actions.

Is there, then, nothing to the charge of "bias" levelled against AI from many quarters of the world? A less facile case could be made using this same ideological prism, i.e., a Left/Right lens. But to be persuasive any critic would have to remain high in the stratosphere looking down at an abstract globe. The moment one moves closer to earth with this lens the image begins to blur and distort. As the regions of the world come into sight, only in Europe and Asia can AI's work be made out dimly through the Left/Right prism, pointing however to opposing conclusions. Nothing has focus in the Americas where there is an overwhelming preponderance of rightist regimes, nor in Africa or the Middle East where Left/Right is hardly the fundamental political reality. If one comes still closer to earth, where the countries of the world come into view, everything gets blurred by the Left/Right lens and any critic is reduced—as Stephen Miller was—to groping for arbitrary comparisons. If one comes finally down to earth and touches solid ground, where "the individual in the cell" comes into focus, the Left/Right lens must be cast aside. Amnesty International has no Left/Right lens and such a perspective plays no part in the way AI looks at the world or seeks to act within it.

A more potent charge of "bias" comes from those who, borrowing from economics, use a different ideological prism—i.e., a North/South lens. Criticism from this perspective proceeds much the same way Miller's *Commentary* article does, first calling into question AI's approach to human rights violations and then accusing AI of exhibiting in its work a political bias. Why does Amnesty International not defend economic and social rights? Why does Amnesty not defend national liberation rights? Why does Amnesty attack only the manifestations of human rights violations and not the exploitive world economic system that is the underlying structural cause of these violations? Examined under these lights, it could be said AI's literature presents "a strange picture of the landscape of injustice" and AI's concerns reveal a serious disproportion. Is not AI's membership mostly in developed countries, and are not AI's actions mostly upon developing countries? Is it not "bias" if AI's reporting on the violations of a chosen few of the whole range of human rights influences governments in developed countries to threaten sanctions on governments in developing countries? Imagine the field day that could be had with "favoritism" if when using the North/South lens a critic were to use statistics in an equally arbitrary manner and compare the number of times AI has testified before US congressional

committees on human rights violations in developing countries with the number of times AI has testified before the legislatures of developing countries on violations of human rights in the USA. A foregone conclusion when arguments are couched in these terms would be that AI must have some policy, or at least some conscious set of attitudes, leading to a practice of whispering softly when it comes to the developed countries of the North but shouting vehemently when it comes to the less developed countries of the South.

The use of the North/South lens is, in fact, far more a practice on the international scene today than is the use of the Left/Right lens, and Amnesty International increasingly encounters attacks on this basis. Yet within the field of human rights, as distinguished from economics, the North/South argument falls as completely as does the Left/Right argument. The human rights AI defends are universal rights, internationally recognized as such: the right to freedom of expression, the right not to be tortured, the right to life. Amnesty International does not devalue other rights in making this choice. On the contrary, it sees economic, social, and cultural rights and civil and political rights to be equally indispensable and interdependent. It keeps a limited mandate for only one reason: to get results. Besides, the North/South way of looking like the Left/Right way of looking, is persuasive only so long as the critic remains in the human rights stratosphere gazing down at an abstract globe. The moment one begins to descend towards earth the image of this lens starts to distort and blur. When the regions of the world come into sight, AI's work can be made out through a North/South prism only within the Americas, not with Europe or Africa or Asia or the Middle East. Coming yet closer to earth, where the countries of the world come into view, everything gets blurred together and all comparisons become arbitrary. When solid earth is finally reached, and "the individual in the cell" comes into focus, the North/South lens must similarly be removed. From the perspective of "the individual in the cell", which is the basic focus of AI, the notion of a North/South bias has no meaning and no validity.

Amnesty International has deliberately chosen to defend certain universally recognized human rights. Wherever it finds men and women deprived of these rights, it will do what it can to help them. It is in this sense that AI's worldwide volunteer movement claims to be impartial. In so far as no major region or political ideological bloc is devoid of violating these rights and AI pursues its task within all of these, its work can also be said to be balanced.

Amnesty International is not without error. Adoption group members have been known to write an impolite letter to a head of state, national sections to publish a crass attack on a country, the International Secretariat to issue a press release wherein a fact has been wrong. Yet in the history of the movement the errors have been happily few; moreover when discovered efforts are made to correct them. Nor is Amnesty International without problems. Some have become more pronounced with the receipt of the Nobel Peace Prize. New members have joined whose energies need to be harnessed and who need to be trained in AI work. Expectations of help have dramatically risen in all parts of the world, as has the demand for human rights information by the media, private and public organizations, and governmental and inter-governmental bodies. Pressure has increased inside and outside AI urging it to take up more tasks at the same time that what is done in AI's name must more than ever be meticulous and of the highest stan-

dard. New strains as well as new possibilities have arisen with the further internationalization of the movement as its roots grow deeper in all regions of the world. To this picture must be added the tragic truth that the forces of repression in the contemporary world have not stood still. AI today confronts little diminution in old means of repression while new techniques are being introduced. Whether Amnesty International can meet the challenges it faces and continue to be "an enterprise that has brought home to many", as Stephen Miller has put it, remains to be seen. Its task is not made easier when AI is attacked in a carelessly written article by a self-styled supporter which is then published without proper verification by an influential journal and credulously read and quoted in various parts of the world. ●

THE 1980 BUDGET: WHERE TO CUT? LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE— JANUARY 1979

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, last January I mailed 244,000 legislative questionnaires to my constituents in the Second Congressional District of Arizona, which includes parts of Maricopa and Pinal Counties, and all of Cochise, Pima, and Santa Cruz Counties.

In the questionnaire, I asked 10 questions having to do with the Federal budget. Two dealt with a balanced budget and taxes. With the remaining questions, with the exception of the two on social security, I tried to take a slightly different approach this year. Instead of listing broad national categories and asking Arizonans if they favored cuts or increases for spending in those categories, I tried to bring in examples of Federal spending that profoundly affect our State, our counties, our cities, and the whole range of special services, programs, and agencies which serve hundreds of different groups, from farmers and ranchers to teachers, doctors, miners, and all the others.

The results are interesting, and I want to share them with my colleagues. The interest, however, lies not in any surprises, rather it lies in the fact that the questionnaire results dramatically demonstrates the crosscurrents that seem to be dominant in our country today.

Overwhelmingly, southern Arizonans told me they want a balanced budget this year. Personally, I believe that pace to be too fast and that it could cause a recession. But I think that I owe my constituents a good, hard effort to achieve that goal, if that is their wish.

But with the exception of education, and perhaps of veterans' programs, where residents of the Second District believe that some cuts can be made, they asked that spending for defense, health, agriculture, and law enforcement be kept about the same as it has been.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the people in our country are frustrated. I believe they feel cheated; they are watching their savings

being nibbled to death by inflation as prices continue to spiral upward, and they want relief.

But if we are to move toward more cuts in Federal spending and a balanced budget, there will be some painful decisions. It is not fair to make wholesale exemptions, removing certain departments or agencies from strict budgetary scrutiny. We must look for all of the fat, not just part of it. And that is what I plan to do in the weeks and months ahead.

As part of that effort, I will be holding hearings in my congressional district on the Federal budget and its impact on southern Arizona. A large number of public officials and private citizens have been invited to attend and give testimony. I am looking to see not only which Federal programs have the most support, and why I should vote for them, but from those people who wish to cut the budget, I hope to get specific programs and specific dollar amounts.

There will be two hearings. The first is on Friday, March 9, at the city of Tucson's Council Chambers, 250 West Alameda, from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. The second hearing will be at the Sierra Vista Community Center, 3020 Tacoma, starting at 10 a.m. on Saturday, March 10. I invite any and all of my constituents who are interested in this most important issue to join me at what should be two very interesting sessions.

The questionnaire and results follow:

THE 1980 BUDGET: WHERE TO CUT?

As the 96th Congress begins its work in this new year, our country faces some big decisions. And I need your help and advice.

Nearly every year, I have sent a questionnaire to the half-million residents of the 2nd Congressional District (parts of Maricopa and Pinal Counties and all of Cochise, Pima and Santa Cruz Counties). This year, the questionnaire has a different format. Let me explain why.

A few weeks ago we had an election and a majority of the voters sent a message to the Congress, which I think reads something like this:

Deadly and persistent inflation threatens our jobs, our savings and the national economy. Living costs have doubled in 10 years. A key cause of inflation is federal deficit spending—spending more money than is collected.

The deficit must be reduced or eliminated. The first place to begin is to cut fraud and waste in good programs, and then eliminate the bad programs.

The voters also are saying that we are a progressive, fair and compassionate country, and that we taxpayers want good schools, police and fire departments, clean parks and adequate Social Security for Americans who have worked hard all their lives, and that handicapped and unfortunate people ought to be helped.

Most Southern Arizonans might agree with these generalities. We all want the most for our money.

But then comes the hard part. Our society is made up of hundreds of occupational, business and professional groups, trade associations, labor unions and you name it. Each group sees things differently. And the same is true of the different regions of our country, and the same goes for our big cities, and our rural people, and so on.

When a member of Congress casts a vote on the floor of the House, he must carry the feelings, frustrations and hopes of all

these groups and constituents—and the hard part comes because a member of Congress rarely gets to vote on the generalities of an issue.

(It would be nice if the Speaker would say, "All opposed to fraud and waste of federal dollars, vote 'aye'")

But we must vote on specifics—specific dollars for specific programs. When Jimmy Carter calls the Central Arizona Project a wasteful boondoggle, I call it "Arizona's last waterhole and key to the future." When the President said he was determined to fight inflation by cuts in domestic spending, George Meany called it "reneging on a campaign promise" and said Mr. Carter was "embracing economic policies that breed recession and unemployment." And so it goes.

There are conflicts, and they are constant. Over the term of one Congress, hundreds of big and complicated spending proposals are voted up or down. Most votes are "packages."

Thus, for example, the 1980 \$125 billion defense bill may have an objectionable missile project (which may eventually cost \$20 billion)—but it also has \$10 million for a new runway at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, and money to build up Ft. Huachuca—both items I strongly favor.

Does the good in that bill outweigh the bad? Do I vote against the bill because of one bad part? And if so, how do I explain myself? Or is it better to vote "for" D-M and Ft. Huachuca, even though I object to the new missile project?

There are other complications. How do I get my colleagues from Florida or New York or Oregon to vote for the CAP, if I oppose, say, their housing or urban development bills, or something critical to their constituents?

Suppose I vote against all my colleagues' issues—what happens if I can't muster my votes for the CAP? I have jeopardized the very life not only of my congressional district, but of my entire home state.

So, my questionnaire this year tries to put the questions to you the way they are put to me. And I'll warn in advance that you may find yourself saying, "This question is unfair!" And it may be.

But as you read, you may also find yourself saying that you would like to vote "yes"—but with some qualifications, or "maybe," or "it all depends."

And I sympathize with those feelings—because I feel the same thing virtually every day Congress is in session. Except Congressmen can't vote "maybe" or "with qualifications." The voting machine has but two cold buttons: "aye" and "nay."

And here we are. If none of the answers is precisely your position, select the one closest to it. If none is very close, leave the answers blank.

(If you have additional comments, or wish to suggest cuts or increases in areas not listed, please jot them down on a separate sheet and send it along.)

Thanks for your help.

QUESTIONS

1. Balanced Budget. Congress will write a new budget this spring. President Carter will propose that we spend about \$535 billion, and is estimating that we'll collect about \$505 billion, for a deficit of \$30 billion. With regard to the deficit, which is closest to your opinion:

A. It's about right; cutting too fast might throw the country into a recession, 36.2 percent.

B. That's still too much red ink; I'm for a balanced budget this year, 61.5 percent.

C. Did not answer, 1.6 percent.

2. Spending. Taxes. If you answered Question No. 1 with "B," and are for a balanced budget this year, should we achieve that goal by:

A. Increasing income taxes for all Americans by 10 percent, 5.5 percent.

B. Cut \$30 billion more in federal spending, 64.6 percent.

C. Did not answer, 31.2 percent.

3. Defense. About \$125 billion, or nearly a fourth of the entire federal budget, will be earmarked for national defense. President Carter and others argue that the Soviets are increasing their military forces and that we must match this with a 3 percent increase in our spending (above the rate of inflation). Others insist that defense spending is already more than adequate and that we ought to hold the line at last year's level, which was \$112 billion. Still others would cut the defense budget further. If you vote for less, you must consider that something at Ft. Huachuca would likely be eliminated. You might end up cutting retiree benefits, or that new runway at Davis-Monthan, or even part of the D-M aircraft storage operation. If you vote for more, than you have to cut somewhere else—in senior citizen programs, schools, hospitals, agriculture. Considering all of this, would you:

A. Increase spending for defense by \$13 billion, 35.3 percent.

B. Hold the defense budget at last year's level, 43.7 percent.

C. Make cuts in defense spending, 22.9 percent.

D. Did not answer, 1.3 percent.

4. Social Security. Another big piece of the projected budget will go to Social Security. We must allot money for that program, plus Medicare and disability insurance, out of payroll taxes. The system is in some financial trouble. Last year, we took in \$111 billion, but paid out \$116 billion. We can't keep that up. Under a 1978 Act of Congress, payroll taxes which finance Social Security increased slightly this month. They will balance this part of the budget until we can decide what to do to make the system financially sound. Do you vote to:

A. Help working people by repealing the current increases and leave the system in a deficit, moving closer to bankruptcy, 4.4 percent.

B. Keep the 1979 increases, but hold off on any future increases until Congress can act to determine if there is a better way to finance the system, 66.8 percent.

C. Balance the Social Security budget by cutting back the payroll tax and financing up to a third of the Social Security fund with general revenue, 22.9 percent.

D. Did not answer, 3.8 percent.

5. Universal Social Security. Social Security now covers about 106 million Americans, most of our work force. But many groups need not belong—federal and state employees, teachers, others. Some argue that the system should be universal (everyone pays, everyone is covered.) Some, on the other side, argue that if they have a retirement program of their own that equals or betters Social Security, they should be left alone. Do you think that:

A. Social Security should cover everyone, 32.1 percent.

B. Groups not covered should be able to stay out of the program if they wish, 65.5 percent.

C. Did not answer, 2.7 percent.

6. Education. A big chunk of next year's federal budget, \$12.9 billion, will go to education. This share has grown in recent years. Many people contend that the federal contribution has gone too far and that education should be financed largely by state and local sources. Southern Arizona gets large amounts of money in education assistance, ranging from \$5.3 million in impact aid to a combined \$45.1 million for the University of Arizona, Pima College and their students. Cutbacks in this category will either increase local property taxes or curtail jobs and opportunities

in education. Do you believe that federal support of education is:

A. Too big and ought to be cut, 50.3 percent.

B. About right, 34.3 percent.

C. Too little and ought to be increased, 9.2 percent.

D. Did not answer, 1.4 percent.

7. Veterans' Affairs. A major share of the national budget goes to veterans' affairs. Some say cuts can and should be made here. Veterans and others say there is a need to increase spending for items like hospitalization. Additionally there is a push for a new national cemetery, and World War I veterans want an expensive new pension bill. Veterans in Pima, Santa Cruz and Cochise Counties alone receive some \$74.9 million in federal money each year. Should we:

A. Spend more, 9.6 percent.

B. Spend less, 41.5 percent.

C. Spend about the same, 46.7 percent.

D. Did not answer, 2.3 percent.

8. Agriculture. Agriculture is important to all of us. For the last two years, Southern Arizona has been hit with floods, and the overwhelming damage was to crops and farmlands. In 1978, the federal government spent \$227.9 million in Arizona on a variety of agriculture-related projects and programs. Some say cuts can be made here, but we could lose items like the \$4.1 million available for farm ownership loans. Others believe we should spend more on agriculture and that we owe farmers a decent return for decent work. Would you vote to:

A. Cut agriculture spending in Arizona, 34.1 percent.

B. Increase it, 15.1 percent.

C. Keep it at the current level, 48.2 percent.

D. Did not answer, 2.5 percent.

9. Health. The federal government will spend \$63.4 billion this year on health, and there is more and more talk of some form of a national health insurance program. In Tucson, Kino Hospital has had its share of financial difficulties. And the University of Arizona gets millions each year for research on a wide range of disease, including heart, lung and mental illness and cancer research. Should we:

A. Cut health spending, 31.8 percent.

B. Increase it, 22.5 percent.

C. Leave it at about the same level, 44.1 percent.

D. Did not answer, 1.9 percent.

10. Law enforcement. The Justice Department is a big spender. The Department does not break down its budget according to congressional districts, but it's a good bet that a major share of the Arizona allotment of \$3.3 million for the Drug Enforcement Administration and \$11.6 million for the Immigration and Naturalization Service went to Southern Arizona operations. The FBI had a \$6.2 million budget for Arizona last year, and a share of that went to the Tucson field office. Many Southern Arizonans consider these functions vital and argue that we need much more of the same. Others will argue that some of this ought to be cut. Taking both sides into consideration, would you:

A. Cut this spending, 29.2 percent.

B. Increase it, 21.9 percent.

C. Leave it about the same, 46.2 percent.

D. Did not answer, 3.3 percent. ●

JOHN LINCOLN

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, as I have often done in the past, I would like to take this occasion to pay tribute to an

outstanding citizen from my congressional district.

After serving for 15 years as the superintendent of the Highway Department of Gloucester City, N.J., Mr. John Lincoln is retiring. As superintendent, John proved to be an excellent administrator, setting and achieving high standards for his department. In turn, the residents of Gloucester City benefited from the quality service performed by the road department.

His contribution to the city was not limited to his employment but rather he gave willingly of his time by participating in the community government and activities. His admirable career record speaks for itself. He was formerly Gloucester City Council president, tax assessor, president of the Lions Club, and president of the Little League Association, to name a few.

John has set a fine example to all citizens of any community displaying the merits of "getting involved" not for the sake of oneself, but for others as well.

I am certain that Gloucester City residents will attest to John's achievements and I would like to join them in their commendations of this fine man. ●

WE DESERVE BETTER AT THE U.N.

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, when Representative Andrew Young testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I was the only Member of Congress to appear and testify against that nomination. Later, I introduced an impeachment resolution after it was quite clear to all that he was not working in the best interests of this country and in fact was hurting American foreign policy. In this effort I was joined by 10 other Members. From time to time, various other voices spoke up in agreement. Still later on July 13 of last year 82 Members of the House agreed with me that a vote on my resolution of impeachment ought to be debated. However, Mr. Young goes on and on with outrageous statements. Recently, another voice was raised—that of Mr. Marvin Stone, editor of U.S. News & World Report, who in a fine editorial of February 26, 1979 informed his readers that America deserves better than Andrew Young and I agree. The editorial follows:

WE DESERVE BETTER AT THE U.N.

(By Marvin Stone)

Andrew Young is at it again. "Only neo-fascists in this country," he declared recently, "would be willing to support the neo-fascism of the Smith regime" in Rhodesia.

By these words the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations hoped to intimidate any members of Congress who might consider voting to permit trade with Rhodesia, now that a black-majority government is in prospect.

The Smith-sponsored surrender of white power is indeed imperfect, more gradual than partisans of immediate turnover would like. It infuriates the two Soviet-backed guerrilla armies, which want to seize control of

Rhodesia for themselves. These are the same bandits who, armed with ground-to-air missiles, have shot down two civilian airliners, the latest outrage claiming 59 lives on February 12.

What Smith offers is the only visible alternative to a bloody black-white conflict, to be followed probably by a civil war among blacks. Given the minimum blessing of normal relations with America, the Smith alternative might just succeed. And members of the U.S. Congress have a right to evaluate those chances without the stab of twisted invective.

Young's innuendoes are remarkably like those with which the new and developing nations themselves, in concert with Russia, have elaborated the U.S. in the United Nations for many years. Oddly, his latest sally comes at a time when a glimmer of hope can be seen for the American position at the international forum. When Vietnam invaded Cambodia, the United States found itself suddenly in the same camp with the Third World, and the Security Council voted, 13 to 2, to demand removal of the troops. Russia and one satellite, Czechoslovakia, made up the opposition.

Here was a demonstration that the Third World's future does not automatically lie in a monolithic cooperation with the Russian bloc against the United States. If this is a true precedent, it holds high importance in the light of the last decade's misalignment.

Pat Moynihan, now in the Senate, demanded several years ago that someone step in at the U.N. to fight for America's ideals and good name. Tapped for Ambassador, he found the job frustrating but made his presence known. The senator's latest book, *A Dangerous Place*, chronicles the constant verbal aggressions of the anti-U.S. bloc. When there was a report on moves to end colonialism, the U.S. was said to be oppressing Puerto Rico—which in reality is free to choose its own destiny. A conference on feeding hungry peoples? The United States—actually the advocate of giving away its own foodstuffs—was accused of having stolen the world's resources.

Is it too much to hope that our Third World friends will cease such behavior, since they see that their lives do not depend on sandbagging the United States? Habit is distressingly strong, but we should give them every help in breaking it. Such an effort will require a person with special qualities.

This brings us back to Andrew Young. Despite his intolerable misstatements about his own country, or more probably because of them, many of the developing nations consider him an effective Ambassador.

Young never was our idea of the person for the job, nor is he now. He is Carter's choice, so he is there. But the last thing that the majority of Americans want at the United Nations is an Ambassador who feels that the way to woo Third World countries is to denigrate the United States.

What we need—more urgently than ever—is an Ambassador who can carry forward the job of speaking up for America on the floor of the United Nations.

If Andrew Young feels differently, surely there is another place where he can continue his personal crusade, while someone else represents the United States in the United Nations. This country deserves better. ●

THE DEBATE ON PUBLIC FINANCING

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD an editorial from the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat of February 12 that summarizes much of my feeling about the proposal for public financing of congressional campaigns:

LET CANDIDATES PAY

When a person chooses to run for the U.S. House of Representatives, he should be prepared to pay his campaign expenses himself—with the help, of course, of those who legally wish to contribute to his electioneering.

Such candidates should not be assisted, as a new bill proposes, partially by public contributions from the \$1 checkoff fund provided on the federal tax forms. The bill also would place a limit on total spending for a House campaign—a limit of \$150,000.

We have no argument with financing of the presidential campaigns with funds provided by the tax-form checkoff. However, although House candidates go to Washington if they are elected, basically they run on local issues and win on local favor—though they may give passing attention to what the national party line may be. Therefore, let them find their campaign finances in their own backyards, not from backyards all over the country.

If people are concerned that less-than-wealthy candidates have little or no chance of election, then let the emphasis be placed on the spending-limit aspect of the proposal and forget about the checkoff.

However, candidates with limited funds do get elected. Their candidacies can attract adequate contributions. If they can't, perhaps they are not worth electing. ●

WORLD BANK PROJECT SLOWS FLOW OF EMIGRANTS TO UNITED STATES

HON. MATTHEW F. McHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, from time to time allegations are made that there are numerous shortcomings in our foreign assistance programs generally, and in the programs of the World Bank in particular.

In view of this, I believe the Members might be interested in an article which appeared in the New York Times on February 15 which I am including in the RECORD for the benefit of those who may not have seen it.

Entitled "Mexican Rural Programs Slows Flow of Emigrants to U.S.," the article discusses a successful program sponsored by the World Bank that benefits the poor while serving important American interests.

I hope that our colleagues will take the time to read this article if they have not already done so, for I believe that it shows rather dramatically what can be accomplished through our participation in the World Bank and similar organizations.

The article follows:

MEXICAN RURAL PROGRAM SLOWS FLOW OF EMIGRANTS TO U.S.

(By Alan Riding)

IXTLILCO EL GRANDE, MEXICO, Feb. 5.—Sixto Pliego Torres pushed back his sweat-stained straw hat and waved at a small pump house that was pouring water into a narrow irriga-

tion canal. "Last year we were sitting around waiting for the rainy season," he said. "This year we have a fair tomato crop."

Around him six peasants worked silently, crouching as they felt under the leaves for ripe tomatoes, then walking slowly to wooden boxes, careful not to tread on the young corn plants that will keep the nine-member Pillego family in tortillas for the next six months. "Last year all these boys had migrated looking for jobs," Mr. Pillego went on. "This year they can stay home and work."

In the chronically depressed countryside, Ixtitlico el Grande, 70 miles south of Mexico City, is still something of an exception. Nevertheless, it is one of a growing number of villages benefiting from an ambitious Government program aimed at slowing the exodus from the rural sector by creating jobs and improving living conditions in the poorest regions.

With illegal migration to the United States certain to be a main agenda item during President Carter's visit here, the United States Government has been quietly encouraging the program. As evidence of this support, Mr. Carter, on his only trip outside the capital, will fly to this village the day after his arrival in Mexico for a firsthand look at one of the projects.

DOLLARS TO AID THE PROGRAM

Although the Mexicans receive no direct American assistance, the United States backed loans of \$230 million from the World Bank and \$40 million from the Inter-American Development Bank for the program. The Ambassador to Mexico, Patrick J. Lucey, has visited several projects in recognition of Mexico's efforts to curb the flow north of jobless peasants.

The program is still modest compared with the dimension of the problem—1,000 migrants arriving in Mexico City every day, a million or so crossing into the United States every year in search of work. So far the program benefits only a fifth of the rural population of 25 million. However, it is growing rapidly, and by 1982 should cover most of the countryside.

Known by the acronym PIDER, for the Spanish words meaning Rural Development Public Investment Program, it began almost as an experiment in 1973. Reacting against the wastefulness of vast efforts to improve rural institutions, it turned to the grassroots level, studying the needs and possibilities of individual communities and then carefully coordinating governmental actions in new "microregions."

The principal aim has been to improve the living conditions of the poorest people, according to Dr. Miguel Angel Cuadra, director of the program. "The way we do it is to increase production, to create permanent jobs, to raise personal income, to improve social welfare and to involve the local populations in the development process," he explained. "If the result is to reduce migration, well, that's fine."

The key to the effort's success is that it has avoided becoming yet another bureaucracy. With a small staff of technicians and financial experts, it contracts out work to other governmental departments. In contrast to previous attempts at integrated development, it has strict control over its purse strings and can define its priorities.

"PIDER is really unique," an enthusiastic World Bank official commented. "We think it could be a model for many developing countries. It's also an approach that could be applied in other areas such as urban development because essentially it's just a sleek administrative mechanism."

In defining a microregion, the agency picks communities of fewer than 3,000 inhabitants where per capita annual income is under \$1.00 but where there appears to be potential for development. "There are villages in the desert that we frankly can't do anything with,"

Dr. Cuadra conceded. "But we're not just concerned with agricultural development. We're after rural development as a whole."

In practice this may mean stimulating fishing, handicrafts, small mining projects, modest tourist resorts, beekeeping and village factories as well as cultivation of new crops. It also means building feeder roads, providing electricity, drinking water, primary schools and health clinics, and even remodeling village squares and painting houses. In the long run, though, 70 percent of investment is aimed at productive activities.

BUDGET CONTINUES TO INCREASE

Despite a federal austerity program, the budget has grown from \$88.3 million in 1973 to \$320 million this year, and it is expected to exceed \$500 million in 1980. By the end of the year 106 microregions covering 5.5 million people will have received almost \$1.3 billion.

The experience of a region in Morelos State, which includes the village of Ixtitlico el Grande, illustrates how small but carefully planned investments can have dramatic impact on a community. With a population of 106,000 today, the microregion has received the equivalent of \$12.5 million over five years. For many local people it has meant a transformation of their lives.

In the shaded village plaza, recently remodeled by the Government, the headmaster, Berulo Sánchez Rosas, spoke proudly of the renaissance of Ixtitlico el Grande. "In the past the place was only alive during the rainy season," he said. "Between January and May everyone had to leave to look for work. This year only a few young men have gone."

In this community a handful of \$20,000 water pumps made the difference, enabling smallholders—family plots average less than five acres—to plan cash crops of tomatoes, onions and melons as well as corn and beans for their own consumption during the dry winter season. The farmers, in turn, have hired workers who left in previous years.

A MORE HABITABLE COMMUNITY

Employment is the key factor, but Ixtitlico el Grande is also a more habitable village today. It has drinking water, lighting and some paved streets, and all but 30 of the 640 children attend school.

"When I first came here 22 years ago this place was a disaster," Mr. Sánchez recalled. "We still have many needs, but Ixtitlico has been reborn. We've had outside help, and the community has also united to help itself."

In nearby villages a similar story is told. At Telelilla, a primary school is crowded with children whose older brothers and sisters missed out on education. At Tenangoin, in the shadow of a magnificent sugar hacienda that was destroyed during the 1910 revolution, working capital was provided for a 20-member cooperative factory making nut candy for sale in Mexico City.

Not all microregions have been so successful, officials are quick to point out. Some have been slow to take off while others have suffered from bad administration. "Sometimes the priorities are wrong," a field worker explained. "Electrification may come when drinking water is needed, or a road is built to the village before more jobs have been created, so it just means the unemployed can migrate more easily."

It is too early to gauge the impact the projects are having on patterns of migration. On the one hand officials hear of many villages like Ixtitlico el Grande where the exodus has slowed. On the other hand they know that hundreds of thousands of peasants continue to migrate to the cities or cross into the United States every year.

From a social point of view the program

is probably the most successful of its kind in Mexican history. "There is almost a missionary zeal about the PIDER people," a World Bank official said. "And, amazingly, they don't seek publicity. They're just getting on with it." ●

WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

HON. DAVE STOCKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, the mandatory aspects of the President's "voluntary" wage and price controls went into effect. On that same day, our colleague, Mr. Brown of Ohio, spoke in Dayton, Ohio, on the subject of the legality of a mandatory wage and price control program. I commend the speech to the attention of my colleagues. I believe it makes a solid contribution to the current debate over the program's legality.

WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS: AN ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN CLARENCE J. BROWN BEFORE THE DAYTON CHAPTER OF THE NATIONAL CONTRACT MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 15, 1979

Mandatory wage and price controls have been instituted in the United States four times.

The first was in 1942 under authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942.

The second was in 1951 under authority of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

The third was in 1971 under authority of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970.

The fourth began today, February 15, 1979, under no authority at all.

President Carter, who announced the latest wage and price control scheme on October 24, 1978, insists on describing his program as "voluntary guidelines."

Yet the Western Pulp and Paper Workers Union, in a suit challenging the legality of the program, said, "To call the sanction of loss of government contracts for failure to comply with wage ceilings a 'voluntary' program is a fiction that could only fool a lawyer."

I am among 13 members of Congress who joined the Paperworkers' suit against the government on Dec. 15, 1978 by filing a "friend of the court" brief contending that President Carter has crossed over the constitutional line dividing executive and legislative authority. Quite simply, in his frantic zeal to regain control over runaway inflation, the President has trod on our turf.

Our brief argues:

The controls are not voluntary, but mandatory, because Federal contracts may not be obtained by companies refusing to "volunteer" to comply.

The President lacks authority to impose mandatory wage and price controls in the Federal Property Act.

The history of congressional action on wage and price controls is that they have been specifically authorized for limited periods of time in emergency situations.

It is not possible to infer that Congress has implicitly authorized the President to impose mandatory controls; in fact, when controls last expired, Congress specifically denied a request that control authority be extended.

Unfortunately, the government was able to sidestep the constitutional question in the Paperworkers' suit by rushing into court with the contention that the companies in-

volved in negotiations with the Paperworkers do not have any government contracts exceeding \$5 million—the size it says is required to bring sanctions.

The federal judge then refused to enjoin the government from enforcing its program because the Paperworkers were not affected, but he held the case open to allow the union to return to court if it were to find future government tampering in its contract talks.

The President's chief inflation fighter is Alfred Kahn, a talented and dedicated deregulator who became Carter's best appointment when he was named to head the Civil Aeronautics Board. Unfortunately, Kahn will now be remembered as the fellow who failed to resist strongly enough when President Carter asked him to head the disastrously wrongheaded and illegal wage and price control program.

When asked to address the legal question, Kahn properly cites the endorsement he has received from his attorney—the U.S. Justice Department. You can't fault a guy for getting stuck with a lousy lawyer.

Of course, until a federal court directly addresses the issue, the strength of the government's case, as outlined in a December 11 Justice Department memorandum, cannot be conclusively tested. Yet, in addition to the Paperworkers and the congressmen who joined them, there are some pretty powerful legal forces aligned against the Justice Department.

The House Government Operations Committee, on which I serve, looked into the wage and price control program in a subcommittee hearing 10 days ago. We heard testimony that the program is illegal from the American Bar Association and from the U.S. General Accounting Office.

GAO General Counsel Milton J. Socolar explained that, "The regulations require that all solicitations on or after February 15, 1979,—today—"expected to result in new contracts, orders under existing contracts, or supplemental agreements to existing contracts in excess of \$5 million, contain a clause whereby each offeror certifies it is in compliance with wage and price standards issued by the Council on Wage and Price Stability."

Failure to certify means no contract, except in the case of sole-source major weapons contracts, which are likely to receive waivers for national security reasons.

GAO points out that the Council on Wage and Price Stability Act, cited by the government as authority for its program, specifically provides that, "Nothing in this Act . . . authorized the continuation, imposition, or reimposition of any mandatory economic controls with respect to prices, rents, wages, salaries, corporate dividends or any similar transfers . . ."

The Justice Department ignores the 1947 Armed Services Procurement Act and goes beyond it to the 1949 Federal Property and Administrative Services Act for its next citation, noting the apparently broad authority for the president to "prescribe such policies and directives, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, as he shall deem necessary to effectuate the provisions of said Act . . ."

However, GAO testified, the Act not only does not implicitly confer wage and price restraint authority on the President, but there are "several indications in the statute and its legislative history to the contrary."

For example, debate over Section 201 (a) led the Act's chief House sponsor, Congressman Holtfield, to declare in debate that the procurement methods the President could set "could not extend to regulation or control of the reasonableness of contractors' rates," quoting GAO's summary.

The Justice Department memorandum goes so far as to assert that the law does not re-

quire that formally advertised contracts go to the lowest bidder. GAO responds: "The statute requires that award be made to the responsible bidder submitting the lowest priced responsive bid, the only exception being where a proper determination is made to reject all bids."

As experts in government contracting, it should be easy for each of you to imagine a scenario in which a bidder with historically lower prices, could find himself in a cost squeeze that would prevent him from meeting the guidelines. Even though his prices remained far lower than the first contractor, he would be prevented from receiving the contract award.

Quite clearly, the intent and the letter of the procurement law would be violated, the taxpayer would be denied the lowest price product or service, and the unfortunate would-be contractor would be penalized for his past efficiencies.

Incidentally, while the Justice Department cites only the Council on Wage and Price Stability Act and the Property Act of 1949, GAO notes that the procurement methods prescribed in the Armed Services Procurement Act, with which you are more directly concerned, "are essentially the same as those in the Property Act, i.e., a general requirement for formal advertising with 'such free and full competition as is consistent with the procurement of the property and services needed.'"

GAO concludes, "We are unaware of any provision in the Armed Services Procurement Act which would authorize the Executive Order 12092 (wage and price control) program, or of any other statute which would provide such authority."

The Justice Department attempts to stretch the President's authority beyond the limits of the Property Act by citing the court approval of executive orders applying affirmative action programs to government procurement. But GAO notes that this is done "in the furtherance of a separate statute prohibiting discrimination and in light of a long history of such executive measures with the knowledge and acquiescence of the Congress."

Wage and price controls are not only not authorized by the laws cited by the Justice Department, but, in fact, are explicitly prohibited by another law, enacted in 1946 as an amendment to the Second War Powers Act: "Nothing in this Act or any other Federal Act shall be construed to authorize the establishment by any officer or agency of the government of maximum prices for any commodity or maximum rents for any housing accommodations."

Justice lamely argues that the section was implicitly repealed when Congress twice subsequently granted temporary wage-price control authority. GAO flatly states: "This is an erroneous interpretation of section 645 b. It does not prohibit the implementation of explicit price stabilization authority; rather, it prohibits the inference of such authority from nonexplicit legislation."

Finally, climbing to the very summit of absurdity, the Justice Department contends that if not implicitly repealed, the statute has become void through nonuse. Oh, come now, Mr. Attorney General, if there were no murders and, hence, no murder trials, for a period of time, would the laws against murder become void through nonuse?

With Griffin Bell and Jimmy Carter off tip-toeing through the tulips in a legal fantasyland, where does that leave the rest of us?

As of today, if you work in contracting for the federal government, you are under order from your chief executive to procure goods and services under a procedure which is clearly illegal. But you do not have the luxury of reaching that conclusion. Only a court can do that.

If you work for a defense contractor or a

Fortune 500 company, you have the option of going to court, but chances are your company has already decided to go along. Alfred Kahn has announced that 22 of the top 25 federal contractors and 200 of the Fortune 500 companies have pledged compliance.

Many, no doubt, fear that failure to do so, even if they could win in court, would bring down federal retaliation in a number of other ways. The president effectively neutralized business opposition to the disastrous National Energy Act last fall by threatening to turn loose on dissenters the allegedly independent regulatory agencies.

If you are a member of Congress, you are left playing the waiting game, with your "friend of the court" brief ready to back up any brave contractor who decides to test the president in court.

Meanwhile, the government's case may grow stronger. Congress is considering a requested expansion of the Council on Wage and Price Stability staff to enforce the program and a wage insurance proposal to protect complying labor unions from excessive increases in the cost of living. Approval of either proposal would provide the government with some of the "knowledge and acquiescence of the Congress" which bolsters the use of the procurement procedure for affirmative action.

While the wage insurance proposal appears in some jeopardy, the COWPS expansion is much more likely. Still, neither gets around the direct statutory prohibition of wage and price controls, and I think it is unlikely, at the moment, that the president would request or the Congress would grant direct legal authority.

Beyond the trivial issues of legality and unconstitutionality, what's wrong with wage and price controls?

First, they're a bandaid. They don't cure the disease.

Second, they're counterproductive. They actually contribute to inflation.

By distorting both production and consumption, controls cause shortages, hoarding, waste—and higher prices. In the economy, prices work like nerves in the body, signalling what is needed.

When prices are controlled, the message gets garbled. The system reacts to false signals, and produces one blunder after another. The artificially low prices tend to stimulate demand and set the stage for a price explosion when controls are lifted.

Worst of all, the wage and price controls divert our attention from the base cause of inflation: faulty federal monetary and fiscal policies. It's true that President Carter paid lip service to the need for less government spending and regulation when he announced the wage and price controls, but the immediate plunge of the stock market and the world money markets showed that by then, his credibility on those promises was shot.

Another reason: even while proclaiming his aversion to government regulation, the President was attempting to throw the regulatory net over two major industries—energy and health. His anti-regulation efforts have been restricted to several superficial reorganization plans and a regulatory analysis body made up of the regulators themselves.

Here's one reason why: President Carter said he has cut the deficit by one third since 1976, from \$66 billion to \$40 billion.

Technically, that's true. But look at the rest of the facts: 1977 was the last Ford Budget, not 1976, and the 1977 deficit was down to \$45 billion. President Carter hiked that up to \$58 billion in 1978 and pushed for a \$60 billion deficit in 1979. It was reduced to \$40 billion only because of revenue estimate revisions and the inability of the bureaucracy to spend the money as fast as President Carter wanted to.

Even more serious than the credibility

problem on government regulation and spending was the implication that President Carter was opposed to any tightening of the excessive money creation which was at the heart of the problem.

Finally, on Nov. 1, with the dollar plummeting toward disaster, the President reversed himself and ordered serious measures to bolster the dollar, combined with a Federal Reserve Board promise to tighten up the money supply.

So far, the results are encouraging. There has been a small slowdown in the rate of growth of the monetary base; not a jolting reduction, but enough to make a difference.

If the Fed. Reserve Bd. refuses to cave in to those who are frantic about interest rates (which, in real terms, are actually quite small), we should continue to see a gradual tightening of the money supply, a gradual firming up of the dollar, and a gradual reduction in the rate of inflation.

We must combine this policy of restrained money growth with a fiscal policy much tighter than the \$29 billion federal deficit President Carter has proposed. Even that excessive figure is a charade, held down by cuts in programs Carter knows Congress will restore, and by rosy economic predictions which are unlikely to come true.

Then we must attack and reduce the burden of government overregulation, which is costing the American consumer \$98 billion a year.

If we do all these things—pursue tight monetary and fiscal policies and reduce government regulation—we can dump the President's illegal wage and price control

policy in the Potomac and free up the government procurement process for the purpose for which it was intended—to get the taxpayer the best quality product or service at the least possible cost.●

OIL SPILLS FROM BARGES

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the increasingly serious problem of oil pollution from tank barges. This past year, we witnessed more than a 400-percent increase over 1977 in the volume of oil spilled by barges into the waterways of the United States. According to recently compiled Coast Guard statistics, last year's pollution volume nearly doubled the amount of oil spilled during the previous record year, 1975.

The area most hard hit was the Gulf of Mexico, where barge spills increased by some 1,300 percent from 573,329 gallons in 1977 to 7,287,685 gallons last year. The Atlantic coast was also severely affected, suffering a tripling in oil spill volume from 674,575 gallons to 2,121,409.

OIL SPILLS FROM BARGES (1973-78)

	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	Total
Atlantic:							
Number of incidents.....	173	180	155	205	198	135	1,046
Oil spilled (gallons).....	54,750	328,063	128,100	774,654	674,575	1,028,255	2,988,388
Great Lakes:							
Number of incidents.....	9	6	18	41	28	10	112
Amount spilled.....	2,241	570	1,050	429,278	11,360	283	444,782
Gulf of Mexico:							
Number of incidents.....	148	354	409	465	605	450	2,431
Amount spilled.....	615,593	1,612,206	357,116	435,151	573,239	559,285	4,152,590
Pacific:							
Number of incidents.....	57	40	22	60	50	49	278
Amount spilled.....	1,772	1,122	2,465	5,498	12,707	38,919	62,483
Inland:							
Number of incidents.....	278	228	223	217	221	208	1,575
Amount spilled.....	575,505	408,281	2,088,637	265,347	372,287	405,309	4,115,266
Total:							
Number of incidents.....	665	808	827	988	1,102	852	5,242
Amount spilled.....	1,249,861	2,350,242	2,577,368	1,909,919	1,644,168	2,032,051	11,763,509

SPACE PROGRAM DIVIDENDS INCREASING EVERY YEAR

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, The American public is coming to ever greater awareness of the practical applications of our national space program as ably expressed in a recent editorial of Today newspaper in Cocoa, Fla. The editorial clearly defines and enumerates many of the benefits our people are enjoying in their daily living and commercial dealings as a result of our space program. I commend this editorial to my colleagues in the House and ask that they continue to reflect on its excellent points as they consider, later in this session, appropriations for continuing our space program.

The editorial follows:

In a photograph on the front page of Today's Thursday edition the planet Venus floats eerily in space millions of miles from Earth. An accompanying story was prompted by the fact that data from the Pioneer Venus probes had indicated mysterious lightning and chemical fires on the planet.

Some people probably shrugged and dismissed the story as another example of what comes from NASA's exotic space missions. They should be spending some of that money down here, the skeptics might have grumbled over their breakfast coffee.

Unfortunately, the idea that the space program's achievements have impact only on distant planets is a common one. The mysterious-looking space hardware launched toward other planets or into orbits of our own tends to be extremely expensive, and its functions often are difficult to understand by the layman.

They are difficult, that is, until the technology developed by the space program touches our own lives in ways that are very familiar and easily understandable. On Thursday, for instance, Today's lead story involved a major snowstorm that had closed schools and snarled traffic all over the East Coast.

Nationwide, barges accounted for nearly 10 million gallons in oil spills, stemming from 855 separate pollution incidents. These startling statistics underline the need for action to improve tank barge construction and operating safety standards. One alternative is contained in H.R. 1741, a bill which I recently introduced along with 17 cosponsors and which would require:

First. All newly built barges to be equipped with double hulls; and second, beginning on January 1, 1983, that all existing barges 15 years of age or older, be equipped with double hulls.

According to the Coast Guard, the vast majority of the petroleum spilled by barges occurs in incidents involving a rupture in the hull, and a recent study estimates that "approximately 90 percent of the pollution due to hull damage could be eliminated if the entire tank barge fleet converted to the double hull construction standard."

Action in this area is clearly warranted, and it is my hope that 1979 will witness the establishment of barge protection standards at least equivalent to the initiatives which Congress successfully implemented last year for oil tankers.

The following is a statistical analysis provided by the Coast Guard of oil spills from barges for the years 1973-78:

The path of that storm had been tracked by satellites feeding data to the National Weather Service, which uses that information in its forecasts. People therefore were better able to prepare for the massive storm bearing down on them.

Here in Florida we have come to depend upon satellites for tracking hurricanes. Now we can monitor the giant storms for weeks instead of relying upon earlier methods, which gave people in warning areas only a few days or hours to react.

As familiar to us as the threat of hurricanes is the state's multimillion-dollar citrus crop, much of it produced by the groves which carpet Central Florida. Because of data furnished by satellites growers can keep a wary eye on a line of freezing weather as it creeps down the state.

This saves the citrus industry hundreds of thousands of dollars every year because grove heaters, which are very costly to operate, can be left off until almost the last minute.

This trend is being repeated around the globe as satellites act as man's eyes in space, capable of detecting weather fronts, ice fields, dust storms, and even outbreaks of disease among crops.

This improvement in information gathering already has resulted in countless lives being saved, and has prevented the destruction of millions of dollars worth of crops of various kinds.

As the years go by the beneficial spin-offs of the space program will become more and more apparent, even to the most intransigent skeptics. In the meantime, like most noble efforts, it is little understood and an easy target for criticism. ●

CAP

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to remove the "CAP" imposing a budgetary ceiling on the Food Stamp Act for fiscal 1980 and 1981. Although best estimates are that the CAP for 1979 is at a sufficient level to permit the program to operate unimpeded through September 30 of this year, it is possible that we may have to reexamine the matter if food prices continue to expand at the current rate. Allotments for July 1979 will be based on food prices through March 31 and very well could exceed the projected \$200 a month for a family of four if increases of over 1 percent continue through February and March.

As you remember, Congress imposed a limitation on the program on the basis of budget assumptions and projections made in the summer of 1977. At that time, we were unable to predict the terribly devastating increase in food price inflation that would cripple our economy in the past 2 years. In those "good old days" of the summer of 1977, CBO estimated a food price rise of only 12.5 percent from 1976 to 1979. That figure is now expected to reach 26 percent. Likewise, CBO assumed the spread to increase by 16.9 percent by 1980 and 21.8 percent by 1981. Those spreads are now projected at 36.2 percent in 1980 and 46.1 percent in 1981.

If Congress does not remove or raise the CAP, the Secretary of Agriculture will be legally forced to reduce benefits to the very citizens who are hurt most by inflation. According to CBO, if the CAP is not raised by October 1, the poor, the sick and the elderly will have their allotments reduced by almost 20 percent. If the Secretary delays this cut for an additional 6 months, the further losses could total nearly 40 percent.

By removing the CAP, Congress would not be abdicating its responsibility to exercise financial oversight and control over program expenditures. Even without an arbitrary CAP, Congress and its appropriation committees must still approve every dollar spent in the program. The reason the administration and I are proposing a removal of the CAP is to insure that the food stamp program responds directly to actual economic conditions not hypothetical predictions. I urge my colleagues to support me in this endeavor. ●

COMPARISON OF SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT PENSIONS

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of misinformation circulated regarding the differences between social security and civil service retirement pensions. As provided for by the 95th Congress, a commission is currently studying the feasibility and desirability of universal coverage. The study will make a report of its findings and recommendations to Congress in December of 1979.

The following article which appeared in the Washington Post does an excellent job of explaining the problem that faces Congress in examining the pros and cons of expanded social security coverage.

The article follows:

CIVIL SERVICE NEST EGG—SOCIAL SECURITY PENSIONS ARE FAR SMALLER

(By Spencer Rich)

Robert and John Smith, identical twin brothers, begin work in 1949 after finishing college. Each works 30 years, is now 55, and earns about \$20,000 at the start of this year. Their salary histories over the years are identical, except that Robert worked for the U.S. government and John for a private business.

If Robert Smith plays his cards right, he can expect to receive \$320,000 in combined civil service, Social Security and private pensions over the rest of his lifetime, measured in constant 1979 dollars. Four-fifths of it will come from his civil service pension.

All he has to do is retire from his U.S. job at 55 and start drawing his civil service pension, then go out and get a job in private industry at his old salary until he's 65. His civil service pension will keep coming in; meanwhile, the 10 years of private employment will earn him a Social Security pension and a private pension when he reaches 65, assuming he works in a firm with a private pension plan.

Brother John, who works all his life at the same salary as his twin, but for a private employer, won't be so lucky. In the normal course of things, he, too, will work until he is 65. Then he will get a Social Security pension and a private pension.

But his combined pension benefits for the rest of his life will total only \$170,000 measured in constant 1979 dollars.

Calculations for both brothers assume that they live to 79, the life expectancy of a man who has attained age 65.

These startling differences in benefit totals for a hypothetical set of twins, resulting from the fact that one worked part of his life for the federal government, illustrate why there is a growing clamor in this tight-budget era to cut costs of the civil service retirement system.

Some proposals would throw it out and give U.S. employees a Social Security pension plus a supplementary pension typical of those in private industry. A move in this direction failed in the last Congress but the issue is on the agenda again.

The American Federation of Government Employees, American Postal Workers Union and other U.S.-worker unions will battle the changes.

"I don't think we'd deny civil service retirement is a nice deal," Greg Kenefick of the

AFGE said in an interview, "but that goes part and parcel to [compensating for] bad working conditions, low status and low pay for federal workers. Just because you see a lot of GS-16s riding around in big cars around here, it doesn't mean their salaries are typical of federal workers all over the country."

Social Security has some benefit advantages over civil service. Civil service has no "wife's benefit." For widows and children of workers who die young, for young disabled workers and their families, for some older widows, Social Security benefits can be higher, because Social Security is designed in part to protect the needy rather than reward long-term employees for years of service.

Social Security benefits aren't taxable, while civil service retirement benefits are. And Social Security beneficiaries receive Medicare at 65, though this is probably offset by the fact that retired federal employees can purchase an excellent health care plan for \$52 a month, with the United States putting up \$60 a month to help pay premium costs.

Nevertheless, for the most retirees civil service is a far better deal than Social Security, even where the private industry worker's Social Security benefit is supplemented by a private pension, which isn't always the case.

Civil service has three great advantages: The civil servant can retire at 55 after 30 years of service whereas the Social Security retiree must be 65 (or he can opt for 62 with a reduced benefit).

Civil service benefit levels are far higher, equivalent to what a worker in private industry would get only if he received Social Security plus a good private pension.

The entire civil service pension receives automatic cost-of-living increases twice a year. But a person who receives a Social Security pension plus a private pension normally get regular cost-of-living boosts only on the Social Security part, because 97 percent of private pensions don't include automatic cost-of-living increases. So even if the private industry employee starts with combined Social Security and private pensions equal to his civil service counterpart, he quickly falls behind because inflation erodes the private pension's value.

The civil servant who can retire at 55 (with a pension equal to 56.25 percent of his highest three-year earnings' average) can then go out and find a private job, earning the right to Social Security later and perhaps a private pension as well.

This allows many to pile one benefit on top of another. In fiscal 1980, about 520,000 civil service beneficiaries, of a total of 1.4 million on the rolls, are expected to draw \$1.6 billion in Social Security in addition to their civil service pensions. Some aren't well to do, but President Carter has vowed to reduce such "double dipping" if they are.

The higher civil service benefit levels are reflected in these figures: If an individual worked for the United States for 42 years, earning \$40,000 a year his last three years, and decided to retire in 1979 at 65, he'd get a civil service pension of \$2,667 a month. A private industry worker with an identical employment record would get \$503 a month from Social Security—the maximum. Even if he had a wife who was entitled to the "free" additional "wife's benefit," his total would only be \$754.

Moreover, a civil servant of 55, retiring after 30 years with an average salary of \$20,000 his last three years, would get a pension exceeding \$900 a month. This is still higher than the Social Security husband-wife maximum—and it is attainable at 55, not 65.

Government figures show that civil servants going into retirement at 55 in mid-1977 after 30 years of work averaged \$953 a month as an initial benefit.

By contrast, private industry workers go-

ing on Social Security rolls at ages 62-65 in mid-1978 averaged \$277 a month, which would rise to a bit over \$400 in cases where the "wife's benefit" was payable.

Suppose the Social Security recipient also receives a private pension? Will his total benefits equal what he could get under civil service with the same salary history? Sometimes.

But a great many private pensions are very low—the average for those who got them was only \$185 a month in 1975—and most private industry retirees don't get such pensions. In 1975, only 7 million to 8 million persons were drawing private pensions nationwide. These figures are probably higher now, but still wouldn't make up the gap in benefits.

The civil servant does make a higher payroll contribution—7 percent of entire salary, versus 6.13 percent on the first \$22,900 for a private industry employee subject to the Social Security tax.

But the federal worker gets back the payment very rapidly. All he puts in comes back to him in pension money within 18 months of retirement on the average, according to Thomas Tinsley, deputy assistant director of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (formerly the Civil Service Commission).

What all this adds up to is a system that is pretty expensive compared with a combined Social Security pension and private benefit.

Pension system costs are usually measured by actuaries by a figure called "normal cost."

The "normal cost" of the civil service retirement system is estimated at 30 to 35 percent of payroll, according to Edwin Husted, civil service chief actuary. This means that to pay all the benefits eventually accruing to any class of employees, funds equal to 30 to 35 percent of their pay over their working lifetimes in U.S. employment would have to be put aside at given rates of interest, inflation and wage growth.

Under civil service, the employee pays about 7 percentage points of the cost and the government pays the other 21 to 28 percentage points. This means that the government is paying about four-fifths of the total cost.

(Despite this, the fiction persists among many federal workers that "employees pay half.")

By contrast, the "normal" cost of Social Security is 13.8 percent of payroll (excluding Medicare) for all benefits that would be payable over their lifetimes to workers aged 18 to 22 who enter the labor force in 1978. And the typical private pension, according to Lynn Vandercock, an actuary with Wyatt and Co., pension experts, would add another "5 to 6 to 7 percent of pay as a normal cost."

So the civil service "normal cost" is far higher than Social Security plus a typical private pension.

Some federal employee unions challenge these calculations, but they are the ones generally used by the U.S. government, and actuaries say they are valid.

Rick Gelleher of the AFL-CIO public employee department defended early-retirement provisions as a national trend. He said the Auto Workers, Steelworkers and many other unions recently have negotiated contracts with industry calling for retirement at 55—even some for retirement after 30 years regardless of age.

As much as 10 percent of outlays for civil service retirement could be saved if the normal retirement age were changed to 65, as in Social Security, civil service actuary Husted estimated. (Outlays last year were \$9.6 billion.)

He also estimated savings of 15 percent if, instead of receiving cost-of-living increases

on their entire civil service pensions, beneficiaries got the automatic increases only on that portion of the pension equivalent to what the benefit would be under Social Security (say 70 percent of the benefit).

Most observers believe the only fair and politically feasible way to change the system is to "grandfather" current U.S. employees into the present civil service retirement system and apply any new rules only to future employees.

Federal employee unions aren't buying this. Kenefick said the attack on costs of the retirement system is merely a "lever to reduce" other federal employee benefits.

Moreover, he said, current employees fear they won't be grandfathered in but will see the rules changed on them in mid-career.

"We're not engaging or trying to engage in a ripoff," he said.

Federal unions are powerful and may win their point. But at a time when social planning experts are already talking of eventually raising the Social Security regular retirement age from 65 to 68 to help cut costs of that system, it seems questionable whether such features of civil service at age 55 normal retirement can be permanently preserved. ●

FAA SHOULD LISTEN TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. MATHIS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER), in urging support for the bill which he has introduced today and which I am proud to cosponsor. The bill would bring about a greater degree of public participation in developing regulations of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) relating to the use of navigable airspace. The airspace regulations proposed recently by FAA appear to be grossly discriminatory toward the private pilot, while doing little or nothing to insure additional safety for commercial aviation. It is, therefore, absolutely essential that the FAA reconsider these proposals on the basis of a complete record of public comments.

The refusal by the FAA to extend the 60-day comment period is entirely unreasonable and unacceptable because this action will preclude many interested and affected parties from submitting their views. Sixty days is an insufficient time to enable the public to evaluate the full ramifications of such complex regulatory proposals. The bill which we have introduced would require a period for public comments of at least 120 days in the case of proposed airspace regulations, as well as mandating formal presentation of the reasons for such proposals to the appropriate House and Senate committees in open public hearings.

Mr. Speaker, I have formed my views on this matter after full consultation with Mr. Henry Pfanz of the polit's lobby and other appropriate aviation interests. This seems to me a reasonable, responsible approach for us to take under the circumstances. We do not attempt to substitute our judgment in the safety area

for the expertise of the FAA. We do, however, attempt to insure that the FAA makes its decisions on a full record of public comments and expertise before it makes final regulations that will have the greatest possible effect on all private aviation and particularly the pilot who owns and flies his own aircraft.

The FAA's attitude of "let private aviation take the hindmost" is patently discriminatory, particularly in those areas of the country which are not blessed with an abundance of commercial air transport. Finally, I would like to associate myself fully with the statement on this subject made by my colleague from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER), whose expertise in this area is well known.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. ●

IN COMMEMORATION OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. RONALD M. MOTT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of Lithuanian Independence Day, which was officially observed on February 16, I would like to join with the Cleveland chapter of the Lithuanian American Council in commemorating the 61st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania.

As Americans, we take great pride in our independence, our freedom of speech, and our right to worship. But at this time, we should reflect on those who are not as fortunate; the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, whose basic rights are being denied them by the Soviets.

I commend these people for their efforts to preserve their national heritage and for their pursuit of independence for their homeland.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the following resolution, adopted by the Cleveland chapter of the Lithuanian American Council, in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION

We, Lithuanian Americans of the Cleveland area, gathered at the parish hall of the Our Lady of Perpetual Help Church in Cleveland, Ohio, on Sunday the 11th day of February, 1979, to observe the sixty-first anniversary of the restoration of independence of Lithuania, have adopted the following resolution:

Whereas, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania, a sovereign state and a kingdom since the 13th century that came to an end in 1975, rose again after a 123 year occupation by its neighbors and in its ancient capital of Vilnius proclaimed itself an independent republic; and

Whereas, on June 15, 1940, the Soviet Union broke all existing treaties with the Republic of Lithuania and forcibly and illegally occupied its territory, which fact had been officially confirmed by the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the U.S. House of Representatives of the 83rd Congress and condemned by all U.S. Administrations; and

Whereas, while many former African and Asian colonies have become independent, the Soviet Union continues to subjugate, exploit

and deny all human rights to the Lithuanian people, which is contrary to the beliefs of the civilized community, and through a program of deportations and colonialization continues to change the ethnic character of the population of Lithuania, thereby committing genocide.

Now, therefore be it resolved, that we again demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its armed forces, colonists and its entire apparatus from Lithuanian soil and permit the Lithuanian people to exercise their sovereign rights; and be it

Further resolved, that we repeatedly express our gratitude to the United States Government for the firm position of non-recognition of Soviet occupation and annexation of Lithuania and request the Administration to direct the attention of world opinion at all international forums on behalf of the restoration of sovereign rights to the Lithuanian and other Baltic peoples, to specifically demand this at the European Security Conference in Madrid in 1980, and by other means to influence the Soviet Union to stop its genocidal practices in Lithuania and to cease all acts of continued occupation; and be it

Finally resolved, that this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and copies thereof to the Secretary of State, to both U.S. Senators from Ohio and Members of the House of Representatives from the Cleveland area and to the press.

Resolution proposed by the Cleveland Chapter of the Lithuanian American Council and adopted by this assembly.

K. ALGIMANTAS PAUTIENIS, *President.* ●

MRS. LUCILLE S. SCHLOSSER

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on January 5, 1979, the U.S. Air Force retired its highest ranking woman career Federal civil servant, Mrs. Lucille S. Schlosser, a resident of Kettering, Ohio. At the time of her retirement, which culminated more than 30 years of distinguished service to her country, she was Deputy for Contracting and Manufacturing for the Air Force Acquisition Logistics Division (AFALD), Air Force Logistics Command, at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

Mrs. Schlosser's career has been marked by initiative, extraordinary ability, community service and true dedication to her profession.

She began her career as a personnel clerk at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. In 1956 she took a voluntary downgrade of four grades to begin a career in contracting. During the next 22 years with the Aeronautical Systems Division and AFLC at Wright-Patterson, she has served as a contracting officer and branch chief in research and development procurement, missile buyer, contracting policy analyst, principal contracting officer and director of procurement and production for the entire C-5A cargo aircraft system. Despite the heavy responsibilities of this period, she found time to attend and graduate from the Federal Executive Institute and from Sinclair Community College, Dayton,

Ohio. Also in 1977 she graduated magna cum laude from the University of Dayton.

Her long and distinguished career has been marked by the highest degree of professionalism, imagination, perseverance, and outstanding performance in both technical and nontechnical functions. Many rewards and recognitions have been repeatedly accorded her for her work and contributions to the Nation and the community of Dayton. She has twice received the Exceptional Civilian Service Award, the highest Air Force award bestowed on civilian personnel. Also, the Society for Personnel Administration and the Dayton Jaycees have each given her their Supervisor of the Year Award.

The leadership demonstrated in her assignments has been an extension of the contributions made throughout her career. Her personal commitment to affirmative action is exemplified by her role in furthering equal employment opportunities for women in the Federal work force. She has been influential as a member of the office of the Federal Procurement Policy's Interagency Specialized Work Group to study the role and status of women in procurement nationwide.

Mrs. Schlosser was a cofounder of the Dayton Chapter, National Contract Management Association where she held local offices as well as that of National Director. In addition, she was selected as a member of the National Board of Advisors for that organization. She was the 1977 chairperson of the Combined Federal Campaign for the greater Dayton area and serves on advisory boards at Sinclair Community College and Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio.

In her last assignment prior to retirement, Mrs. Schlosser was responsible for building an organization from its inception. As a member of the steering committee for the Acquisition Logistics Division, she helped to design and develop the organizational structure and to define its role and mission in the U.S. Air Force. The division was created on July 1, 1976. It serves as an interface between the Air Force Logistics Command and other Air Force commands in increasing operational readiness and lowering operating costs of systems and equipment in the Air Force's inventory. Her duties also included the responsibility for advance procurement planning for future Air Force systems as well as management of and policy for the functional buying activities within the AFALD. A cornerstone of her effort has been the development of innovative business strategies designed to increase readiness and lower operating and support costs for major weapon systems and subsystems. In fulfilling these responsibilities she has had a direct and far-reaching influence on the reduction of total ownership costs of such new Air Force systems such as the F-16, air launched cruise missile, EF-111, and the advanced medium STOL transport.

Mrs. Lucille S. Schlosser's superior technical competence, innovation and outstanding leadership have significantly improved the Department of Defense's

contracting and acquisition capabilities. Her distinctive achievements and personal dedication to this Nation and the Air Force reflect highest credit upon herself and the Federal civilian service. ●

SINGLAUB: CARTER HAS OWN VIEW OF "REALITY"

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, this is No. 3 in a series of articles by Maj. Gen. John K. Singlaub USA, retired, that appeared in the Atlanta Journal for February 6, 1979. (No. 2 appears on page 2943 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 21, 1979.) In this last part of the series General Singlaub discusses some of the mysterious twistings and turnings of the Carter foreign policy that have gotten him worldwide attention, but have left our friends and allies confused and dismayed. General Singlaub asks why Carter, for instance, did not once mention human rights in speaking of China, when Red China is known to be the largest human rights violator in the world? General Singlaub also asks the question does "might make right?" In the case of Communist China, she has conducted aggression after aggression since the Communists won the mainland of China in Tibet, Korea, India and Vietnam. The question remains just what standards as a nation do we have left? When will President Carter provide the answers? The article follows:

SINGLAUB: CARTER HAS OWN VIEW OF "REALITY"

(By John K. Singlaub)

The only way we may be able to understand what President Carter is saying about his recognition of Red China is to submerge ourselves into the Orwellian world of 1984 and its doublethink and newspeak.

Consultation of a dictionary for the meaning of words like "reality" or "legal" is of no help when trying to decipher the message that the president delivered on Dec. 15, 1978. "Simple reality," according to Carter, is not just the dictionary definition of the "material or factual existence" of the People's Republic of China. Using that definition, Cuba, North Korea, Cambodia, Uganda, Vietnam and even Taiwan would have to be recognized.

The president has given the term "simple reality" a new, mysterious dimension. It is equally clear that the expression, "sole legal government," does not take into account any law—domestic or international. China has no legal claim to Taiwan whatsoever. So what does "legal" mean now? Carter may think that this is not the way things should have been—but to claim any legal basis for that kind of thinking is indefensible.

Surely he will not involve himself personally in new definitions of borderlines and territories around the world—according to what is "good," "right" or "appropriate." One can be fairly confident that he will not make it his business to reunify other divided countries—East and West Germany or North and South Korea.

It appears clear that the president has been engaged in a redefinition of words. The

danger is such an activity is that eventually the words lose their meaning completely.

Looking beyond the official explanation given for recognition of China, the slogan which seems to surface is "might makes right." The argument goes that rearrangement of recognitions and treaties was inevitable. After all, the Chinese are so many, they can consume so much, and they have oil. In this we have some specifics that may give us some clues for understanding the next redefinition of "reality."

If we look at the relationships of population and gross national product between Taiwan and mainland China, we will notice that the ratios are no larger than the similar figures for Israel and the Arab nations or for Norway and the USSR. Does this mean that in the world of the Carter administration's new "realities," we will stop acknowledging Israel's existence or not support Norway if threatened by the Soviet Union?

In this connection, it is quite probable that Billy Carter's candid remark, "There's a hell of a lot more Arabs than Jews," is only a reflection of this thinking. Billy Carter cannot be blamed for this—his brother introduced the principle. Billy has just drawn attention to the principle's further applicability.

Another reality, in the normal definition of the word, is that the human rights condition in China is much worse than in the Soviet Union. Can we expect the president to start writing letters to Chinese activists, accusing their government of gross violations of human rights? After all, he recently stated: "As long as I am president, the government of the U.S. will struggle for the enhancement of human rights. No force on earth can separate us from that commitment."

Human rights were not mentioned once in his statement on China, and little has been heard since then. Has the human rights question in China been defined into the realm of nonrealities, along with Taiwan? If President Carter really acts or defines reality according to the slogan "might makes right," we cannot accuse him of inconsistency or a lack of conceptual framework on international affairs. But we shy away from the implications this would have on our allies and friends, as well as on the conduct of foreign affairs.

The president also claims that the China agreement was not made for transient tactical or expedient reasons, although the officials have been explaining the large-scale economic and political benefits ever since the rearrangement of recognitions took place.

We have further been told that the Chinese made concessions, which must mean in the new Carter language no concessions at all. China's willingness to permit U.S. arms sales to Taiwan was the single most important concession as reported by the White House. On the same day, however, Chinese Premier Hua Kuo-feng's statement was, "We can absolutely not agree to the arms shipments" and that "arms sales (are) detrimental to a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan question." It seems to me that one of the two parties to this agreement is lying, and it gives us an indication of the reliability of the newly won relations.

The president also stated that "we have already informed our allies and the Congress." Surely some members of Congress would have found a different description for this.

However, if Carter's view is represented by the condescending remark by his national security advisor, Zbigniew Brzezinski—"They were given more than six years' notice"—he may feel he was right to apply the word "already." It was precisely such a shift in China relations under those conditions that had been rejected by previous administrations; so the six years' warning must be one of those Polish jokes used at an extremely inappropriate time.

The president's main foreign and defense policy decisions have been characterized by unilateral concessions—cancelling the B-1 bomber, delaying production of the neutron warhead, withdrawal of troops from Korea, relinquishing the Panama Canal, and recognition of Red China. He does not even seem to bother to ask for compensating concessions—either from the Soviets, the mainland Chinese, the North Koreans, or from Panama. This is definitely conducting bargaining in the Santa Claus spirit.

Why is this done? It is certainly a unique way of administering foreign affairs. It clearly indicates that the administration is craving attention, in this, at least, they have succeeded beyond all expectations.

European allies from Helmut Schmidt to Giscard d'Estaing have on occasion been at a loss in their attempts to understand our current twists and turns in foreign affairs. We have come into a situation where reaching an agreement is of higher importance than the contents of that agreement. Carter seems to have a checklist of accomplishments, and this latest action—the China rearrangement—is just another item checked off.

All this seems to have been made possible by Carter's dislike of the world as it is. The world needs to be redefined—in 1976 open diplomacy was in, and in 1978 Carter decided open diplomacy was out—because all of his actions as well as his desires have to be fitted harmoniously together. Therefore, following this, human rights, Soviet expansionism, and Taiwan are defined into the realm of non-reality.

Forty years ago, in 1939, the type policy being pursued by Carter was defined as appeasement. I wonder if the president has some reason to believe his policies will be any less disastrous this time around.●

THE MUDDY STREET AND NATIONAL SERVICE

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, along with renewed interest by some to restore military conscription, there also is discussion about reviving the concept of universal or national service. I suppose the rationale behind such an idea is that if some young people are forced to serve in the military, then, to be fair, all eligible young people should be required to perform some sort of service to the State. The universal service proposal reminds me of a story I heard at a conference on the draft that was being held at the University of Chicago in 1966. The story was told by Prof. David Bakan who, at that time, was a member of the faculty of the University of Chicago. It reads as follows:

THE MUDDY STREET

One of the streets of Gotham was in bad condition. Each time a wagon would pass it would throw mud at the people on the sidewalk, especially those close to the curb. The wise men of Gotham gathered to deliberate what course of action they should take with respect to it. In the course of their deliberations it was pointed out that it was very unfair that those who were near the curb should be splattered while others were not. The Council of Gotham therefore passed a law requiring all citizens on the street to line up at the curb whenever a wagon was to pass.●

HOW THE CARTER ADMINISTRATION BETRAYED THE SHAH

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the recent overthrow of the government of the Shah of Iran by Soviet-backed revolutionaries is a shattering blow against this country and the free world's goal for stability and progress in the Middle East. Without any question, a major share of the blame for the events in Iran must be carried by the Carter administration which clearly demonstrated its hostility to the Shah and his government, giving the Soviets and their revolutionary clients a clear signal that the United States would not oppose an effort to depose the Shah despite his decades of support for the West.

The clearest reporting of the process by which the Shah was overthrown has been provided by the weekly news magazine, *The Review of the News*, in an article by its Washington editor, John Rees. The article outlines how the inept policies of the present administration have resulted in the loss of Iran to the free world and a consequent gain for the Soviets in their encirclement of the Middle East.

The article follows:

HOW JIMMY CARTER BETRAYED THE SHAH

(By John Rees)

Iran was for 20 years the keystone of America's strategy in the Middle East and a major factor in the economic stability of the Free World. But, in the two years and two months of the Carter Administration, it has ceased to be an ally and is now immersed in anarchy and chaos for which the U.S. President bears the major responsibility. Not since the fall of the Nationalist Government in China has an American Administration committed so damaging a betrayal of a major ally.

What has happened in Iran threatens the entire world balance of power and the economies of the West, and it has come about only because the Carter Administration allowed itself to be used in a program crafted by the Kremlin to destabilize Iran. In the words of a senior Iranian diplomat in Washington, "President Carter betrayed the Shah and helped create the vacuum that will soon be filled by Soviet-trained agents and religious fanatics who hate America."

The vital importance of Iran to the Free World is the result of a number of factors including:

Its geographic location on the southern border of the U.S.S.R. where it is the eastern gateway to the Middle East;

Its oil fields which are the source of between 70 to 90 percent of the oil imported by the countries of Western Europe, Japan, Israel, South Africa (and Rhodesia); and which were growing in significance as a source for U.S. oil imports.

In terms of the Free World's defense strategy, Iran has long been of critical importance. Iran and Turkey are the Middle Eastern members of the C.E.N.T.O. alliance for regional security. From Iran, highly sophisticated electronic-intelligence listening posts, equipped and manned by the National Security Agency, have monitored military activities in the Soviet Union. These have grown to critical importance since the U.S. decided to take the Greek side after the Cyprus invasion and, in retaliation, Turkey shut down all U.S. bases and electronic posts on her territory

and moved so far toward an accommodation with Moscow as to sign a friendship and cooperation agreement with the Soviets.

Even more important, the Shah's well-trained and American-equipped Armed Forces were available to serve as the regional protector of the small, sparsely populated, but oil-rich countries along the Persian Gulf and Arabian peninsula which have been targets for both courtship and subversion by Moscow. Indeed, although there was some tension between Iran and Saudi Arabia (based in part on the fact that they epitomize the two divisions of Islam), the Iranian military had already proved its effectiveness in Oman where at the invitation of Sultan Qabus the Shah's troops wiped out a Marxist terrorist organization and drove its stragglers back to sanctuary in the neighboring People's Democratic Republic of Yemen (P.D.R.Y.).

The P.D.R.Y. has been intimately collaborating with the U.S.S.R. since the British abandoned Aden. Its revolutionary Marxist Government has been on excellent terms with Libya, that other revolutionary socialist Islamic republic, and with the Marxist regimes in Algeria and Iraq. These countries have worked to assist Soviet maneuvers in the Middle East, providing training bases, arms, passports, and other logistical support for terrorist groups ranging from Africa and the Middle East to Europe. The West German Baader Meinhof gang, "Carlos the Jackal," and factions of the Palestine Liberation Organization (P.L.O.) have all had the use of Libyan and P.D.R.Y. facilities. Members of the two chief Iranian terrorist groups, one Marxist-Leninist and the other "Islamic-Marxist," have received training in the P.D.R.Y., Libya, Iraq, and Cuba.

Mere collaboration with the Communists does not make a regime immune from a coup to install a totally controlled gang of Soviet agents. The P.D.R.Y.'s collaborationist Government was overthrown by a Soviet-controlled regime last summer, opening Aden to the Warsaw Pact and Cuban forces as a staging area for operations in Ethiopia. The recent coup in Afghanistan, the attempted coup in Iraq, the civil war in Lebanon, the growing disorders in Turkey, and what is happening in Iran show that an all-out Soviet offensive is underway to capture the entire Middle East for the Communist camp.

With a hostile, anti-Western regime in Iran, the pressure against Saudi Arabia, Jordan, the Arab Gulf countries, and Egypt will increase dangerously.

That this was allowed to happen is from a strategic point of view unthinkable. From a political point of view it is even worse. Under the direction of its able monarch Iran had been transformed in a single generation from a near-feudal agricultural society to an urbanized, burgeoning, industrialized, and modern country with an increasingly Western character. This program of industrialization was carried out under the personal direction of the Shah. His plan was to make Iran a technologically advanced, economically diversified, and self-sustaining nation so that in the next century when the oil ran low Iran would not go into an economic decline and return to the dark ages.

There can be no question that the Shah took his position as a ruling monarch very seriously, shouldering moral and economic responsibility for the emerging Iranian people. Clearly he tried to bring to Iran the best of what Western societies had to offer. And not merely in the material sense. Among the Western concepts and developments he had written into law in Iran were the principles of religious toleration, separation of church and state, and expanded legal and political rights for women. Education was provided for both women and men, and an advisory parliament was set up to which, over the year, additional powers were granted.

These programs were anathema to the fanatical elements of the Shi'ite Moslem clergy who had come to exercise vast power over the peasants because of their enormous land holdings. As in Western Europe during the 13th and 14th Centuries, persons attempting to ensure their salvation had bequeathed land, houses, jewels, and money to the Shi'ite mosques, monasteries, and religious centers. With richness and temporal possessions came temporal authority. But the heart of the Shi'ite clergy's power was control of land in an agricultural society where their economic strength enforced "piety" and obedience to their religious orders. All of the Shah's efforts at industrialization and modernization were therefore viewed as a direct threat to the Shi'ite mullahs—who easily rationalized this as an attempt by the Christian countries to subvert Islam by technology. The resulting hatred of the West led the Shi'ite clergy to collaborate with the Soviet Union and the Communists in Iran.

The Shah particularly cut into the power of the Shi'ite clergy with a land-reform program in which large estates (including those of the Shah and his family) were broken up and given to landless tenants. The compensation paid to both the secular and clerical landowners never made up in their view for loss of the power they once held over their former tenants. Thus the Shah was seen as a man to be destroyed by the West-hating Shi'ite Moslem clergy, their fanatical followers, and the Marxists and Communists organizing among the Iranian intellectuals, students, and industrial workers.

The Soviets realized that by destroying the Shah they might gain unhindered access to their client states of Syria and Iraq; access to the warmwater ports of the Persian Gulf; control of the Straits of Hormuz between the Persian Gulf and the Gulf of Oman, through which move the tankers carrying oil from Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, and Iran; and, control of Iran's own vast energy resources of oil and natural gas. And, of course, such a coup would also bring benefits to the radical Arab states which have aligned themselves with the Soviet Union—Libya, Syria, Algeria, P.D.R.Y., and Iraq. In addition, a militant anti-Western regime in Iran would immediately cut off oil shipments to Israel and South Africa.

As the Shah moved to control these groups who have perennially plotted revolution against him, and to maintain his long-established friendship with the Free World, Jimmy Carter entered the White House and global politics underwent a drastic change.

Soon after President Carter took office in January 1977, reports began to circulate of major domestic political concessions being made by the Shah in response to demands by the Carter Administration. In effect, radicals around President Carter were seeking to impose the "anything goes" political system of the United States in the late 1970s on a country that had been partially occupied by the Red Army during World War II; which had to put down a Communist Government in its Azerbaijan province set up by Stalin's minions; which had a long border with the U.S.S.R.; which barely escaped a Communist takeover in the early 1950s; which had no tradition of Western political freedoms; and, which was in the throes of a drastic social and economic transformation from feudalism.

In the name of "human rights" the Carter radicals were out to destroy the most progressive ruler in Iran's history and turn his throne over to a gang of fanatics out of the dark ages as a prelude to Communist takeover.

By linking various demands to the sale to Iran of sophisticated military hardware and the training of Iranian military technicians and pilots, the radical Carter team began a campaign to "destabilize" the

Shah's Government. In chronological sequence, the successful betrayal went like this: First, pressure was applied to release from prison many of those who had plotted to overthrow the Shah, including members of terrorist groups. After all, the Carter State Department, Amnesty International, and Moscow Radio all agreed that these were "political" prisoners. Next, pressure was applied to alter the Iranian judicial code so that terrorists and subversives were no longer tried by military courts but in civil jurisdictions. Defendants and their supporters quickly commenced the sort of propaganda activities seen in Western countries when the authorities attempt to prosecute revolutionaries. Third, pressure was applied to institute guarantees of American-style "free assembly," that would allow organization of open meetings calling for the overthrow of the Shah's Government. And, fourth, "opposition tendencies" in the ruling Rastakhiz (Renaissance) party were encouraged by the United States.

The Shah's concessions to U.S. "human rights" pressure in order to obtain vital military equipment were, of course, perceived as weakness not only by his enemies among the Communists and the mullahs, but also among his own supporters in the Rastakhiz party. The perception of weakness brought about quick escalation of challenges which the Shah and his Government were unable effectively to check because of increasing "human rights" pressure from President Carter and his team of radicals. By the end of the summer of 1977, university students and followers of the Shi'ite clergy had begun staging street demonstrations on the campuses and in several Iranian cities. These were unchecked and escalated in violence. Some Iranians believe that this opposition to the Shah was actually organized by the Central Intelligence Agency at the order of President Carter. The Iranian magazine *Khandaniha*, for example, carried an article in its issue for December 16, 1978, which said that "Imam Husein Sadr was approached to take up the leadership of a new government, but, because of the vigilance of the Eastern bloc, this plan crumbled and the Imam vanished."

In November 1977, the Shah and his Empress had made a state visit to Washington, D.C. They and all Iranians were given a clear message of the Carter Administration's deep hostility when the Shah was "greeted" by President Carter as some 4,000 Marxist-led Iranian students brandishing clubs and the banners of Iranian terrorist organizations were allowed to mass within a hundred feet of the White House. Wearing masks to conceal their identities, these revolutionaries attacked both American and Iranian residents of this country who had peacefully assembled to welcome the Shah. Many people were injured, but only 15 of the rioters were arrested—and were then quickly released.

The failure to interfere with these violent demonstrations, virtually on the White House lawn, was seen as the clearest of signals that the Carter Administration was willing to see the Shah and his Empress insulted, even directly assaulted by tear-gas, in the streets of the American capital. Obviously Carter was not committed to the survival of the Shah and his pro-American Government. Again quoting from the *Khandaniha*:

"Before that latest trip, the Shah had traveled several times to the U.S.A. without encountering any demonstrations of Iranian students residing in the U.S.A. . . . By contrast, during the Shah's most recent trip such demonstrations (which included Iranians residing in Canada and Europe) were not only permitted, but perhaps even encouraged by CIA officials."

As The Review Of The News reported November 30, 1977, White House media czar Jody Powell had instructed the police "that strict enforcement might make America look

like a 'police state.'" In short, the riot against the Shah was a calculated insult designed to reinforce Carter's radical demands. And, while President Carter and his advisors were urging the Shah toward still more radical and revolutionary changes and concessions in the fabric of Iranian society, the Soviet Union was moving every bit as rapidly to mobilize its long-constructed networks of subversion, sabotage, espionage, and terrorism in Iran.

Viewing revolution in the whole region as an interrelated drama, Moscow now held the dress rehearsal. In April 1978, the Free World suffered a major defeat when the leader of the Communist party of Afghanistan, the Khalq or "Masses" party, seized control of Iran's eastern neighbor in a bloody coup and established a Marxist-Moslem dictatorship. Just as Soviet agents long planted among the Shi'ite Moslems of Iran would soon do, the Afghan Communist despot Nur Mohammed Taraki called for a "jihad" (holy war) against those he designated as false Moslems or "Ikhwanu Shayateen." The latter means "brothers of devils" and is a phrase from the Koran applied by the Afghan Reds to all who oppose the transformation of Afghanistan into a Soviet satellite. It became plain that the Communists had been busy devising a Marxist "liberation theology" for the Islam, just as they had done for Christianity and other religions targeted for subversion.

But the capture of Afghanistan provoked no reaction from the Carter Administration and Washington continued to pump dollars to the new Communist regime. This confirmed to the Kremlin that it was in sufficient control of U.S. foreign policy to prevent a response to Soviet aggression in the Middle East, just as it had prevented resistance to Soviet aggression in Africa. A *de facto* U.S. policy of non-intervention against Communist aggression, even to defend the source of oil and natural gas on which the countries of the Trilateral Commission—North America, Western Europe, and Japan—depend for their economic and military strength, made clear to Moscow that it was free to act as will in Iran.

With the Kremlin's puppet Taraki in control of Kabul, a flood of Soviet-trained agents moved across the border into Iran to infiltrate the mosques, the schools, the Shi'ite monasteries, the bazaars, and the oil fields. By November 1978, there were an estimated 500,000 illegal Afghan immigrants in Iran, in most cases virtually indistinguishable from Iranians living in the eastern provinces. The K.G.B., which had taken control of Afghanistan's secret police, set up large training camps for Iranian terrorists.

Of course the subversion of Iran by Communist agents had been going on for some time. Over the past decade a large number of Soviet intelligence officers from both the K.G.B. and the G.R.U. have been caught and expelled from the country by the Iranian security authorities. Reports show that there have been as many as 4,000 Soviet technicians in various jobs in Iran and another 1,000 from other Communist countries in Eastern Europe. How many of these also had K.G.B. or G.R.U. duties in the subversion of Iran we do not know precisely; but it is a matter of record that the K.G.B. has used as "cover" such organizations as the Irano-Soviet Cultural Society, the local offices of the Soviet news agency Novosti, the Soviet trade mission in Teheran, Soviet consulates in large Iranian cities, a Soviet-owned transport company, and the Soviet hospital in Teheran.

With these resources, assisted by indigenous agents and Iranians in high military and administrative positions whom the K.G.B. had either blackmailed or bought, the Soviet Union commenced a sophisticated political-warfare operation against the Shah in late

1977. A new publication of the Iranian Tudeh Communists, called *Navid* (Good News), began to appear weekly in Teheran. A high-quality production in contrast to the sleazy mimeograph tracts put out by the other Leftist and terrorist groups, *Navid* has been able to respond to the swiftly moving political events in Iran, often bringing out special editions on the eve of major strikes and demonstrations. Its pages reflect the line of the clandestine National Voice of Iran (N.V.I.) broadcasts from Baku on the Caspian in calling upon the Iranian military to mutiny against the Government and for general strikes. *Navid* has frequently used forgeries intended to inflame its targets and began carrying fake proclamations by spurious "rank-and-file" Iranian military groups urging desertion and mutiny. It carried phony accounts of mutinies for months before the recent outbreak of dissension in the Iranian Air Force.

This Communist publication has been publishing the Tudeh party's call for formation of an "anti-dictatorial broad front," the same sort of maneuver the Communists are using in Nicaragua, The Philippines, and other countries. In an effort to win over the Shi'ite clergy, the Tudeh Communists have said that the ayatollahs and mullahs must play the "vanguard role" in this movement. In a June 1978 edition of *Navid*, the Communists offered to place all of their very considerable propaganda, political, and technical resources at the service of this front. *Navid* pointed to the "benefits" that have accrued to the fundamentalist Islamic and socialist Government of Libya and to the terrorist "freedom fighters" of the P.L.O. as a result of their cooperation with the Soviet Union, suggesting that similar "benefits" could come to Iranians who joined the ranks of Communist collaborators.

Not surprisingly, all available evidence points to the fact that *Navid* is produced in the Soviet Embassy in Teheran on its modern printing press, and that it is the voice of the K.G.B.'s covert political-action agents when these can be distinguished from the voice of the Tudeh party puppets.

The alliance of "Islamic-Marxists" or "black and red revolutionaries" is not new in Iran. The largest Iranian terrorist organization, the Organization of Mujaheddin of the People of Iran (O.M.P.I.), originated in a 1963 attempt to overthrow the Shah in which Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini played a leading role. It has spoken of its members as Islamic-Marxists for the past nine years. Thus this unlikely union is not, as several U.S. commentators have claimed, an "invention of the Shah's propagandists." In fact the 4,000-member O.M.P.I. announced in 1976 that it had "joined the Marxist-Leninist revolution" in Iran and was hailed in welcome by its rival terrorist group, the somewhat smaller Organization of Iranian People's Fedayee Guerrillas.

As violence in Iran continued to increase along with the evidence of Soviet involvement in destabilization and subversion, there was no response by the Carter Administration. In a recently released staff study by the House Select Committee on Intelligence, we find the following statement: "The attention of top policy makers was not brought forcefully on Iran until October 1978." The House Intelligence Committee study contains a wealth of "evidence" to support that statement, but it makes no mention whatever of President Carter's meeting with the Shah in November 1977 when it was already apparent that the Communists had targeted Iran for takeover and the violence had literally spilled onto the steps of the White House.

What, we may ask, does it take to obtain "the attention of top policy makers"? The fact is, alas, that those policy makers were well aware that the Reds were out to destroy

the Shah and were trying to help them! The *Washington Post* of February 13, 1979, carries a column which reports that the Shah has told President Sadat of Egypt that C.I.A. set him up on orders of President Carter, and that the Shah had proof of this last spring.

As the Moslem-Marxist alliance gained momentum, a new forbidding figure became central to Iran's tragedy, the 78-year-old Shi'ite religious leader Ruhollah Khomeini, who uses the honorific title "ayatollah" or "reflection of God" reserved for a handful of the most respected Shi'ite mullahs or "masters" of the Koran and Islamic precepts.

This month Khomeini, whose brother had been imprisoned as a member of the Communist party in Iran, returned from 14 years of political exile, all but the last few months in Communist Iraq, having maintained an implacable opposition not merely to the Shah but to the entire Iranian royal family, to the military which supports the Shah, and to the Constitution and the Government. During his exile, Khomeini issued repeated calls for revolution and the violent overthrow of the Shah. Khomeini says his goal is the creation of a revolutionary Islamic republic that will be anti-Western, socialist, and with the ultimate power in the hands of the chief ayatollahs.

In the words of Michael Ledeen, an expert on Iran at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., there is ample evidence that Ruhollah Khomeini is "a clerical fascist, a violent anti-Semite and an intensely chauvinistic anti-American." This evidence is not taken from any secret intelligence files, but from Khomeini's own writings, lectures, and press interviews. As long ago as December 1968, in *The Middle East* magazine, Khomeini affirmed that the purpose of his Islamic republic would be completely to eliminate all Western influence from Iran. Apparently Communism is not considered a "Western influence" since Khomeini has repeatedly said during the past year that in his Islamic theocracy the Communists will participate as a legitimate political force.

Khomeini's Islamic republic will seek to bring back to Iran the punishments established by Muhammad in the early 7th Century. These include 80 lashes for drinking alcohol; the public stoning of adulterers; cutting off a thief's hand and so on. According to *Newsweek*, one of Khomeini's close aides told their reporter, "you don't cut off the whole hand—just the fingertips." The aide wanted to make clear that this is much more respectful of "human rights" than the Saudi and Libyan practice of hacking off the entire hand at the wrist.

So much for President Carter's effort to destroy the Shah in the name of "human rights." Clearly there is much more involved here.

In December of 1978 the Communist Tudeh party, which had been run from East Berlin by Iranian exile Iraj Eskandari, gave its tentative support to the Islamic revolutionary movement headed by Khomeini. The support was far too tentative for Moscow's liking and it promptly sacked Eskandari. The new boss of Tudeh, one Nureddin Kianuri, immediately issued a statement which read, "The Tudeh Party approves Ayatollah Khomeini's initiative in creating the Islamic revolutionary council. The ayatollah's program coincides with that of the Tudeh Party." The alliance was now a matter of public record.

Which came as no surprise to anyone, although the Carter Administration continued to pretend not to realize that Khomeini's closest adviser, Sadegh Ghothzadeh, alias Asfahani, was well-known to the European intelligence community as a master revolutionary with tight links to the leaders of the French and Italian Communist parties. Asfahani, it develops, also works closely with the Libyan secret service, one of the K.G.B.'s

most helpful collaborating agencies in the Middle East.

In order to facilitate the operation of the newly announced Islamic-Marxist alliance, the Tudeh Communists formed a new front party, the Democratic Union of the People of Iran. In their new guise of a Democratic Union, the Communists began calling for the establishment of Shi'ism as the national religion of Iran, and for full support for Khomeini and his revolutionary Islamic republic. In a mere two months, because of the alliance, they were able to sell in Teheran 300,000 copies of the *Communist Manifesto* and are distributing thousands of copies of works by Lenin translated into Persian.

The highly organized, well-funded Communists have considerable influence not only in the Writers Association, the Bar Association, and in the National Association of University Professors, but also in the poor sections of the major cities where "district cells" have been set up to take control of such tasks as local food distribution, traffic control, medical care, and so forth. And, of course, the price of receiving food, medical care, heating oil, or whatever is political cooperation and subservience to the Communist leaders.

As Khomeini's revolution merged with the Marxists, the slogans carried in the street demonstrations shifted. (Many were written in English for the benefit of American television viewers.) At first the slogans were the conventional "Death to the Shah" and "Long live the Islamic Democratic Republic." They were soon changed to "Power to the People" and finally "Long Live the Revolution." Even in mass demonstrations called by Khomeini forces, there were large contingents numbering in the thousands who were chanting these Marxist slogans. A mid-January march called by a coalition of student Marxist and Communist organizations at Teheran University attracted an estimated ten to fifteen thousand participants.

The rising intensity of revolutionary sentiment was not lost on the Soviet Union, which in mid-January directly endorsed Khomeini in *Pravda*, the official newspaper of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. The Soviet Communist endorsement for Khomeini and his Islamic revolution came because "they have a long established reputation as opponents of tyranny" and because they appeared to be riding "on the crest of the wave of events."

Two days after the official *Pravda* endorsement, former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark, accompanied by veteran activists from the old Hanoi lobby, held a New York press conference to report on a trip to Iran and a Paris visit with Khomeini and his advisors. Clark expressed his hope that the U.S. would take no action so that Iran "could determine its own fate." He echoed the line of a two-year campaign by U.S. activists associated with the Hanoi and Havana lobby saying we must prevent Iran from "becoming the next Vietnam." What Clark meant to do, of course, was to support the Carter Administration's determination to avoid U.S. or N.A.T.O. intervention in support of Iran's military and let the country fall.

The Clark press conference was also designed to ensure that the U.S. Left would do nothing to slow the advances of the Moscow-approved Khomeini takeover. This became clear when in short order Ramsey Clark began arranging for the principal U.S.-based Khomeini supporters to meet covertly with members of the State Department's Iran Task Force, with Senators and Congressmen, and with Carter's Ambassador to the United Nations, Andrew Young.

Ambassador Young's response was predictable. Here was Khomeini with a 16-year record

of fomenting rebellion, subversion, and revolution against an American ally; who was endorsed by the Communists; who was reiterating his detestation of all aspects of the Western world, most particularly his fanatical hatred for all things American. Naturally Ambassador Young praised him, declaring that the Shi'ite leader would "eventually be hailed as a saint."

Others high in the Carter Administration shared Andrew Young's views. When their support for the constitutional Government of Iran was needed, they were privately negotiating with the Ayatollah's supporters in Washington who had been expelled from the Shah's Embassy by Government loyalists. These Iranian subversives, who had penetrated the Embassy staff, were led by Djafar Faghhi, a former Minister Counselor. They boasted to this reporter of their contacts with White House National Security Council staffers, mentioning William B. Quandt and Gary Sick, and with the State Department. They spoke gleefully of their expectation of quick obtaining U.S. recognition of the Government appointed by Khomeini, and declared the intent of Khomeini to have Iran's Ambassador to the United States sent home as a war criminal.

Ruhollah Khomeini has seized power in Iran not merely with the support of the Soviet Union and its agents, but with the direct assistance of the Carter Administration. The question now is how long the 78-year-old Khomeini will be allowed to remain as the front man of the Iranian revolution before the Soviet Union moves to replace him with a more malleable puppet. And the fact remains that, had President Carter not betrayed the Shah, the forces of extremism and fanaticism, Communist and Moslem, would not now have Iran by the throat and a loyal ally of the Free World would have been preserved.

We shall soon learn that the chain of events precipitated by the Carter betrayal of the Shah will affect the life of every American. And when the question is asked, Who lost Iran?, the answer will be: Jimmy Carter. ●

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MONOPOLIES AND COMMERCIAL LAW WILL HOLD HEARINGS

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law will hold 2 days of public hearings on Tuesday, February 27, 1979 and Wednesday, March 7, 1979, to consider H.R. 2060 and its companion bill H.R. 2204.

These bills restore effective enforcement of our antitrust laws by once again permitting indirect purchasers and sellers to recover illegal overcharges from antitrust violators.

The hearings will be held in 2141 Rayburn House Office Building and will commence at 9:30 a.m., and continue in the afternoon.

Testimony on these proposals will be received from: John Shenefield, Chief of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division, a panel of State attorneys general, antitrust practitioners, and legal scholars. ●

THE CONTINUING INTERRUPTION OF MAIL BY U.S.S.R.: PROPOSING A LEGISLATIVE REMEDY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, each year thousands of pieces of registered mail, including private communications, packages, vizovs (invitations to join family members abroad), and cultural materials are sent to citizens of the Soviet Union from individuals and groups in the United States. In recent times, a significant number of these items have either disappeared or were opened, inspected and/or confiscated by postal officials of the Soviet Union in contravention of the constitution and laws of the U.S.S.R., without proper notification given to mailers or addressees about the interruption of their mail service and reasons therefore as required by international postal covenants to which the Soviet Union is a signatory.

Consequently, a large volume of constituent complaints, primarily from the American Jewish community and other ethnic groups expressing their concern and frustration over the failure of the postal officials of the Soviet Union to insure uninterrupted delivery of U.S. mail to Soviet citizens, has been received in congressional offices.

Following discussions with the U.S. Postal Service, key American Jewish groups, and organizations of academicians and other professionals frequently corresponding with persons in the U.S.S.R., I found that the Soviet Union is clearly engaged in a scheme to systematically interrupt certain classes of U.S. mail addressed to individuals in the Soviet Union. Endeavoring to remedy this situation, I have addressed the problem on several fronts.

In October 1977, I participated in the Belgrade Conference which reviewed the Helsinki Final Act hammered out in 1975 at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. At that review session, I submitted to our U.S. Delegation a brief documenting the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics' interruption of international postal communication. With the assistance of Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, head of the American delegation to the Belgrade Conference, we presented to the Soviets our findings and obtained an apparent commitment from the head of the Soviet delegation, Ambassador Vorontsov, to pursue these allegations with appropriate Soviet officials.

On November 9, 1977, I submitted a report to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee detailing the problem of the U.S.S.R.'s interruption of U.S. mail. This report entitled, "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Interruption of United States Mail" (Committee Print 95-9), a product of a year's work involving numerous conferences, discussions, foreign travel, and extensive study

of this subject, documents a systematic undertaking by the Soviet Union to isolate the Soviet Jewish community in general, and other activists who have risen to prominence through their organized opposition to oppressive measures dictated by the Communist Party in particular, from any contact with or aid from the outside world through the deliberate interruption of the international mail system. Unfortunately, short of a nation's registering a complaint with the alleged violating country, there presently exists no mechanism to enforce prescribed international postal standards.

In my report to Congress, I suggested three recommendations to further heighten public awareness of this problem and to place the United States squarely on record objecting to the Soviet Union's flagrant violations of their international obligations to assure the freedom of communication.

These recommendations urged:

First, that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service initiate a formal inquiry into the Soviet Union's deliberate interference with the flow of international mail;

Second, that a resolution be introduced urging the President to lodge a formal protest with the U.S.S.R. over its failure to adhere to international postal covenants to which the United States and the Soviet Union are both signatories; and

Third, the U.S. postal representatives at the Universal Postal Union's Congress in Brazil in 1979 be instructed to seek from other UPU member states support for obtaining a Soviet commitment to respect its international obligations in this area.

On April 26, 1978, I initiated action based on these recommendations by introducing legislation, House Concurrent Resolution 579, urging the President and the U.S. Postal Service to pursue the goals outlined in recommendations two and three respectively.

This measure came before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service which undertook hearings last May and July in connection with my first recommendation urging the committee to conduct a formal inquiry into this matter. As the legislative schedule of the 95th Congress did not allow us to complete our hearings and action on this resolution, I am today reintroducing this legislation so that our committee can complete its inquiry concerning this issue and bring this resolution before the House for its consideration.

Our hearings last year, before the Subcommittee on Postal Operations, chaired by my distinguished colleague from New York and now chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service (JAMES HANLEY), not only confirmed our earlier findings, but served to illuminate and underscore with testimony from a number of perspectives, the intensity of the Soviet campaign to systematically compromise the integrity of the international postal service.

Statements from former Soviet "refuseniks" and activists who have recently emigrated provided our committee with vivid descriptions of the blatant manner

in which Soviet authorities resorted to nondelivery and/or sabotage and mutilation of letters and packages mailed in conformity with the terms of international postal agreements and, indeed, the laws and constitution of the U.S.S.R. which protects delivery of such items.

Representatives of the United States Postal Service testified that from June 1977 to June 1978, there were 2,522 official inquiries concerning registered mail from this country to the Soviet Union, and that this number of inquiries was a reasonable estimate concerning each of the past 4 or 5 years.

Our hearings also pointed out that the Soviet Union admitted its culpability for nondelivery of those items in a distinctly erratic manner. For example, the Soviets have claimed that a greater number of letters and packages have been delivered than returned receipts for those items would indicate. Moreover, the Soviet Union has refused to provide this country timely information about what items it considers prohibited from delivery to that country, thus giving the Soviets ample leeway to seize and not deliver an item they have deemed prohibited.

Our subcommittee received the assurances of U.S. Postal Service personnel that they are taking adequate steps to ameliorate this problem. Testimony from other witnesses and our panel's own inquiries, however, questioned the credibility of such claims. The distinct impression was left with several of my colleagues and with me that while other avenues of relief existed, the Postal Service was content to rely, for a remedy to this matter, on methods and diplomatic channels that have produced little in the way of increased delivery and accountability by the Soviet Union for such mail.

For these reasons, I now urge my colleagues to support this measure I am introducing, so that the necessary executive and congressional impetus can be applied to resolving this problem brought about by the flagrant violations by the Soviet Union of accepted international mail delivery procedures. The U.S.S.R. must recognize that this Nation will not idly tolerate Soviet contravention of those international agreements it has signed guaranteeing the integrity of mail delivery between our two countries.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, in order to share these thoughts with my colleagues, I insert the full text of this resolution at this point in the RECORD:

H. CON. RES.—

Whereas the integrity of the mail service between the United States and the Soviet Union is being called into question by mailers in the United States who assert that postal items are systematically not being delivered to selected addresses in the Soviet Union;

Whereas the explanations required under international law and given by the Soviet postal administration in regard to the nondelivery of mail to certain addresses have consistently been untimely or insufficient;

Whereas the mail which is not being delivered typically is between family members or persons sharing a religious bond and typically consists of personal correspondence or gifts of articles for personal use;

Whereas the nondelivery of mail which is deliverable as addressed and which does not

contain prohibited articles is an interference by the Soviet Union with internationally recognized human rights guaranteed to all persons by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe;

Whereas the systematic exclusion of certain persons from international mail services also violates the Convention of the Universal Postal Union and the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress—

(1) that the President, through the Department of State, should express to the Government of the Soviet Union the disapproval of the American people—

(A) concerning those postal items which are mailed in the United States and are deliverable in the Soviet Union as addressed but which are systematically not delivered by the Soviet Union to the persons to whom they are addressed; and

(B) concerning violations by the Soviet Union of the articles of the Universal Postal Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe; and

(2) that, at the meeting of the Congress of the Universal Postal Union in Brazil in 1979, the representatives of the United States Postal Service should—

(A) bring to the attention of the representatives of the member countries of the Universal Postal Union the Soviet Union's disregard of regulations governing the exchange of mail under the Universal Postal Convention; and

(B) call upon the other member countries for support in encouraging the Soviet Union to respect its international obligations.

STATEMENT ON ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. S. WILLIAM GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

• Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, last weekend, the country and homeland of Estonia marked the 61st anniversary of its declaration of independence.

In the last six decades, Estonia has gone from German to Soviet dominance, to freedom, and back to Soviet rule. The brief periods of freedom the Estonians have had give us an insight into their character and principles. When Estonia was self-governing, their constitution provided clear emphasis on human rights and dignity. The immigrants in their country were accorded numerous guarantees in the Estonian quest for a democracy of social and political liberty.

Perhaps the only thing Estonians have traditionally valued more than human rights has been their own freedom. Over the centuries they have fought valiantly invading armies of Germany and Russia. Though they may now be physically controlled by the Soviets, they maintain their brave fight on a personal level against Russification of their culture. With the support of their people all over the world, the Estonians have managed to preserve a rich sense of culture and tradition.

On paper, the United States still rec-

ognizes Estonia as a free country. But the vocal recognition by the American people of support for freedom and justice for Estonians will serve to reassure them that their plight does not go unnoticed, or their courage unadmired.●

CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN FINANCING

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, one of the issues the 96th Congress will be facing is congressional campaign financing. For too long we have allowed undesirable features to abound: excessive campaign spending, dominance of narrow special interests, and lack of attention to small contributors. My colleague, Mr. MIKVA, with which I am proud to cosponsor legislation establishing a system of public financing, has authored an excellent article on this important reform. The article follows:

[From the Chicago Sun Times, Feb. 3, 1979]

NEEDED: PUBLIC FINANCING OF CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS

(By Abner J. Mikva)

On January 15 the flag was raised high above the Capitol dome and the 96th Congress was sworn in—a comforting reminder to many that democracy is alive and well, and that the people have spoken once again.

But this time, even the inspiring sight of Old Glory could no longer hide the inglorious cost of our congressional election campaigns. The reality of the 1978 campaigns is that the electoral process is alive but not very healthy. It is being stuffed to the gills by special-interest money, while the real nourishment of voter participation is increasingly in short supply.

If the electoral process is not working as it should, then there is little hope that Congress can either. When more and more people perceive that Congress is dominated by wealthy special interests, it is not surprising that more people each year decide not to participate, not to vote. Such a pattern soon becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy.

What is especially alarming is how quickly special-interest political action committees have grown in number—and in the number of dollars they provide to congressional campaigns. Since 1974, the number of PAC's representing corporations, labor unions, trade associations and other groups has nearly quadrupled to almost 2,000. The approximately \$30 million PACs gave to influence the outcome of the 1978 congressional races is a 250-per cent increase in just four years.

That's quite an inflation rate—and at least as threatening to the well-being of the country as the inflation of our economy. For what is at stake is the integrity of the electoral process and, therefore, much of government itself. Unless we are prepared to reverse the trend of congressional campaign spending, we will increase the specter of government by auction, the specter of the best government money can buy.

In 1974, Congress passed legislation for partial public financing of presidential campaigns. That action came after one of the most corrupt presidential elections in our history, when campaign contributions were being stashed in safe-deposit boxes, laundered in Mexican banks and hustled around in black bags. The fact that the 1976 presidential election was one of the cleanest in

recent memory is, in large measure, because of the public financing reform legislation.

The time has come for similar legislation for congressional elections. Last summer, such legislation was considered in the House. It would have placed a limit on congressional campaign spending. It would have matched contributions of \$100 or less with matching funds from the voluntary \$1 tax checkoff fund, up to \$50,000 per candidate. It included features to enable non-affluent candidates to compete more effectively when facing an opponent of great personal wealth.

In short, the legislation would have stopped the inflation in campaign spending and curbed the growing clout of the special interests. Equally important, the role of small, individual contributors would have been enhanced, since candidates would have had important incentives to broaden their financial base.

The legislation I have described was narrowly defeated by 17 votes last July. A large majority of the more than 50 House members who retired when the session ended voted against it. I am optimistic that among the new members in the 96th Congress, there is sufficient support so that public financing can become a reality for the 1980 elections.

An important first step in that direction was taken recently when the Democratic Caucus overwhelmingly approved my resolution to make partial public financing of House elections a top legislative priority during the first session of the new Congress.

In 1974, my opponent and I had the dubious distinction of setting the record at that time for the cost of a congressional campaign—over \$500,000. After only four years, we couldn't have made the top 20 with that amount. And in November's election, we apparently had our first \$6-million senator.

As the special-interest PACs become more entrenched, they will become an insurmountable lobby against campaign finance reform. The PACs already have a lot invested; as the head of one of them said about a candidate his group supported last fall, "You hate to lose an investment." So this year may be the last best hope for public financing—and the last best hope for a more open and less tainted election process.●

OUTSTANDING IMPERIAL COUNTY PUBLIC SERVANT STEPS DOWN

HON. CLAIR W. BURGNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. BURGNER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most dedicated county officials I have ever had the pleasure of working with on matters of mutual concern has recently left his post on the Imperial County Board of Supervisors, and I just want to take this opportunity to salute his outstanding service in behalf of the people of Imperial County. Herman "Red" Sperber has just concluded 8 years as district 1 supervisor on the Imperial County Board, but his mark on public and community service will long be felt.

Red was the driving force in the establishment of the Imperial County mental health program, whose focus is "mainstreaming" the mentally retarded rather than warehousing them in institutions. He was also one of the principal backers of the new county juvenile hall and obtained county backing of a local renal dialysis unit now operating at Pioneers Memorial Hospital.

Red's foresight and wisdom will be

missed on the Imperial County Board, but his strong belief that elected officials should set a limit on the number of terms they serve has been self-observed.

Red Sperber's years of service have been truly exemplary, but those of us who know him doubt seriously that the end of his official duties will mean an end to his civic responsibilities.●

EUROPE'S NEW PARLIAMENT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article published in the New York Times on February 18, 1979. The article was written by Mr. Karl Kaiser, director of the research institute of the German Society for Foreign Affairs.

The nine nations of the European communities will hold their first direct elections to the European Parliament this coming June. This event is shaping up to be one of the most important events in the recent history of European integration and is one which warrants the interest and support of all of us in Congress.

The article follows:

EUROPE'S PARLIAMENT

(By Karl Kaiser)

BONN.—Few of those who promoted the idea of direct elections to the European Parliament could foresee the developments set off by such a decision. Long before the 180 million voters cast their votes in June, this decision has already profoundly affected politics in Western Europe and unleashed processes with dynamics of their own. Three areas are particularly noteworthy.

1. The preparations for the elections are changing the substance and structure of national politics in Europe.

European themes have dramatically increased in importance in the party politics of all states of the European Community. Debates on election programs, political strategies and the selection of candidates keep parties busy down to the local level. The subject of Europe, in the past sometimes left to the foreign-policy élites, has become more than ever a part of domestic politics.

In some countries, the powers of the future Parliament are the subject of deep divisions, notably in France where the issue unites (not for the first time) parts of the Gaullists and Communists in a bizarre nationalist alliance. In most countries, if one can believe polls, the election outcome is likely to change the balance of forces among parties and to affect their domestic political structures. It appears that Communists in Italy, and Gaullists and Communists in France, will lose, while Socialists and Social Democrats in France and West Germany are likely to gain.

The elections will create a new, fourth level of political expression beyond local, state and national votes. Though parties will also use the European elections in terms of domestic politics, the process inevitably focuses principally on Europe. For most people, voting will be their first concrete act as European citizens. The community and the idea of European will gain a new legitimacy.

2. The preparation of direct elections is creating new trans-national political links in Europe.

Political parties have formed federations

and alliances across national boundaries: democratic socialists, liberals, Christian Democrats and conservatives. They have worked out election programs and are attempting to conduct a trans-national election strategy. The beginnings of a political infrastructure, comparable to a national party system, are being built at the European level.

3. The direct elections are giving European politics a new focus.

When Social Democrats and conservatives in several countries compete for voters in terms of conflicting conceptions of the future Europe, they politicize the integration process. In the raising of issues of unemployment, economic order or foreign policy, the overdue departure from a much too technocratic Europe has begun.

Party élites are beginning to focus their career on Europe. By sending their staunchest opponents of a supranational Europe into the Parliament, Gaullists or the British Labor Party are preparing the ground for major conflicts in the future. But in doing so, the battles on supranationality and basic political issues will be fought within the Parliament, thus inevitably enhancing its standing.

Since Jean Monnet relaunched European integration after the defeat of the European Defense Community in 1954, Europe has not experienced such a feeling of a new departure.

Does this mean that the European Parliament will have more jurisdictions? Not necessarily! Formidable obstacles will stand in the way of a change of jurisdiction, above all the European Community treaty, which can be changed only with the consent of all states.

But 410 personalities with a direct mandate from Europe's population, comprising major figures like the Gaullist leader Jacques Chirac (an opponent of more jurisdictions) or the former West German Chancellor Willy Brandt are joining the Parliament for a serious purpose: to influence politics. The Parliament will, therefore, become a new focus for Europe's political life.

In any case, the question of formal jurisdiction may not be relevant at the beginning. The national parliaments, bogged down in technocratic details, need not be a relevant model. The European Parliament may well find a new and relevant role: It can fill a vacuum by raising and debating the fundamental issues of European politics—for example human rights, social protection, redistribution of regional wealth and Europe's place in the world. Its contribution to European politics would thus be profound.

It is to be hoped that the United States Congress will acknowledge the election as the great event that it is. The first democratic elections to a West European Parliament in the Continent's history provide an opportunity to express the inherent bonds between democracies on both sides of the Atlantic and to establish a working partnership between two parliaments representing the two largest democratic voting populations in the West.●

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. ANDREW MAGUIRE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, last week marked the 61st anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence. It is a time to recall the important features of

Lithuanian society which make Lithuania's independence not only politically but culturally of crucial importance for Lithuanians throughout the world.

Linguists credit Lithuanian, a Baltic tongue quite separate from Slavic, with being the oldest Indo-European language still spoken. Its roots reach back to the origins of the Proto-Indo-European family of languages. The imposition of Russian on the Baltic States has endangered the continued existence of the Lithuanian language.

"Dainos," the ancient Lithuanian folk tale song form is one of the finest representations of the usage of Lithuanian. Since the 1920's, when Lithuania was free, festivals have been organized, with thousands of participants, where the Dainos are performed. But with school participation in Russian language sessions mandatory and with all television programs broadcast in Russian, the life and vitality of the Lithuanian cultural experience is slowly being sapped.

One advantage of détente is that no country formally obscured by the Iron Curtain need go unnoticed by the free nations of the world. For this reason, the cause of Lithuanian independence, promoted so diligently over the last 30 years, can only continue to retain its prominent place on the world's human rights agenda.●

CONGRESS SHOULD RESIST ATTEMPTS TO WEAKEN FINANCIAL PRIVACY LEGISLATION

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will consider under suspension S. 37, which repeals section 1104 (d) of Public Law 95-630, the Financial Institutions Regulatory and Interest Rate Control Act of 1978.

During the 95th Congress the House Banking Committee, and specifically several members of that committee including myself, devoted a great deal of effort to draft a privacy title to the Financial Institutions Regulatory Act. It was our intention at that time, I believe to protect the rights of all parties concerned without imposing an unreasonable burden on either private individuals or the financial industry.

In implementing these provisions, the Federal Reserve System has placed the strictest interpretation on the language of section 1104(d) of that act. Legally this is the correct approach, although commonsense would certainly suggest something more realistic. But since the language of section 1104(d) as it exists and as it is interpreted would create an expensive burden of compliance which would eventually be passed on to individual customers, I can see the need for the House to resolve this matter before the effective date of compliance.

However, I would like to caution my colleagues about any further attempts to chip away at what should be seen as a milestone in our attempt to protect the

individual from any unwarranted invasion of personal privacy by the Federal Government.

I have been assured that this is not a substantive amendment to the title as far as personal privacy is concerned. That may be so, but already some suggestions have been made by officials from affected departments that other sections of the privacy title should be changed to correct "deficiencies." I have no doubt that these changes would only weaken the protection that we fought so hard last year to achieve. I hope that this Congress will give a clear signal that title XI, the right to financial privacy, is not open to such attacks.●

THE DRAFT IS A TERRIBLE IDEA

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, William Greider, editor of the Sunday Washington Post's "Outlook" section, invariably writes a provocative and interesting column.

But this last weekend, his essay also had national importance. I would like to bring it to my colleagues' attention:

THE DRAFT IS A TERRIBLE IDEA

(By William Greider)

Anyone who knows Charles Peters, the editor of The Washington Monthly, will tell you that he is a wise and warm-hearted man.

Why, I wondered, is Peters pushing this vicious idea in the pages of his little magazine? A rotten idea hiding behind a bland title—"national service."

Charlie Peters fears that America has lost its way, that people are too selfish, that young people need inspiration in the patriotic values. His solution is to force my children into involuntary servitude for the government.

That seems a disproportionate price for my children to pay. To surrender two or three years of their lives to the control of some bureaucrat, civilian or military, so that Charlie Peters will feel good about America again!

Peters wants young people to see the inside of an Army barracks which, I concede, is an interesting experience but, surely not one required for true citizenship. I did my turn in the peacetime Army and mostly I learned about mindless regimentation. As the "national service" advocates describe it, young people could choose alternative civilian chores. Emptying bedpans in nursing homes. Playing truant officer in the slums. Trimming deadwood in the national forests. Sweeping hallways in government buildings. This is supposed to instill the American character in our decadent youth.

If our youth refuse to go, of course, the government will have to put them in prison. Let's not talk around that point because, without coercion, there is no way to make universal conscription fair. Draft everyone, put the shirkers in jail. That will teach the little bastards some patriotism.

Charlie, I asked, do you have any draft-age children at your house?

Yes, indeed, the warm-hearted editor replied. He has a 15-year-old son named Christian, who is a student at Georgetown Day School.

Charlie, what does your son think of this scheme of yours to bring back the draft?

There followed a heavy pause, in which my friend, the editor, got the point.

"I don't know that he knows that's a view of mine," Peters said softly.

Why don't you ask him, Charlie? Charlie promised that he would.

In Washington, this kind of questioning is considered tasteless, bringing a man's family into the large and important questions of public policy, making nasty personal insinuations. The polite dialogue assumes that all are disinterested. But I think this issue of "national service" calls for a little up-front tastelessness. Better now than later.

Parents of adolescent children, in particular, should ask now some of the hard-edged questions that most parents failed to ask 15 years ago, when patriotic docility was still regarded as a virtue. Some of *their* children wound up dead or in wheelchairs, in jail or in Canada.

The first question is: Why? Why exactly is it necessary to bring back the draft? What does the government have in mind for our children? Do not give us the grand abstractions of Cold War ideology which satisfied most citizens in the past, the academic garble about "global strength" and the "balance of power" and all that. Give us practical reasons, homely reasons that are truly connected to America's real bread-and-butter self-interest. Do not tell us our children are needed to fulfill some geopolitical fantasy concocted at a California think-tank.

I do not think the gathering political support for restoring conscription can withstand that kind of hard questioning. Right now, what I see are the formative outlines of an obscene coalition between the liberal establishment and the right-wing militarists who may overlook their differences in order to sell jointly this terrible idea.

On the right, people like Sen. John Stennis want a military draft restored primarily to fill up the ranks with cheap cannon fodder. The all-volunteer military is too expensive and also too dependent upon poor kids, especially poor black kids who still see attractive opportunity in the armed services. The old stalwarts like Stennis are uncomfortable, depending on those young men and women to fight our next war.

Sen. Stennis is 78 years old and never served in uniform. He was too young for World War I. He was a circuit judge during World War II, a U.S. senator for the Korea and Vietnam wars.

Charlie Peters is not exactly the liberal establishment, but the Ford Foundation is. McGeorge Bundy, in one of his last gifts to America as the foundation's president, is bankrolling a campaign for "national service." A blue-ribbon committee with all the best names on it, even including one youth, has studied the idea and decided that Americans should be "educated" to accept its virtues. Since Bundy was one of those global thinkers whose Cold War strategies in Indochina contributed so much to the disillusionment of young people, it is fitting that he should be promoting the grand solution.

This emerging coalition is obscene because the Ford Foundation wants "national service" in order to achieve what Stennis and his friends have spent their public lives fighting—racial integration. All right-thinking conservatives should read the Ford report ("Youth and the Needs of the Nation," the Potomac Institute). They will see that "national service" is another liberal swing at "forced integration."

On the question of coercion, the Ford report is cleverly drafted. The 13-member committee declares itself in favor of a voluntary version of "national service" because it acknowledges that the American

people aren't ready to buy the real thing, a mandatory system. Yet, throughout the 134-page study, the discussion repeatedly returns to the virtues of a mandatory system and how it might work.

For instance, instead of jailing the shirkers, the committee suggests that government benefits—the programs for which all citizens are eligible—could be withheld from any young people who will not serve. "One member," the report said, "has jokingly but provocatively suggested a novel sanction: denying a driver's license to anyone who declines National Service." A good laugh was had by all. Only 4 of the 13 committee members have children young enough to be affected by their brainstorm.

I understand why Charlie Peters wants mandatory "national service," because we have argued about it several times. As a young man, he enlisted in the Army in 1944 and went off to fight fascism. It was a moment of great spirit for America, of great accomplishment, and many liberals of Peters' generation are still, consciously or otherwise, trying to recreate the great crusade of their youth.

But Charlie has another reason that also affects a lot of liberal thinking in Washington. His son attends a private school. Charlie believes in racial integration. He believes in public schools, in bringing Americans of all classes and races together. But he decided, as a father, to take his child out of public school. No one should question the validity of a personal decision, but why should my children lose their freedom because Charlie Peters' values have been disappointed in life?

In cold, practical terms, a system of National Service would accomplish this: It would provide a lot of cheap labor to do the dirty work—both military and domestic. These are necessary jobs that we want done for us but not at full wages. Look around and you see lots of poor people already doing this work although some of them are increasingly unhappy with poverty wages. This is a central contradiction in the prosperous society that flourished after World War II, a contradiction that bothers Charlie Peters as much as anyone else. But his plan to conscript young people to do the dirty work would hide the contradiction rather than confront it.

If America's opinion leaders truly are worried about the decline of idealism among our young, they should consider a system of universal conscription for adults. Imagine the example of McGeorge Bundy, say, taking a year or two off to sweep up in a nursing home. Or Sen. Stennis, if he were only a bit younger, interrupting his political career to stand watch somewhere on freedom's frontier.

I mean to be serious about this: The young people I know have complicated views on America, a sophisticated mixture of old-time idealism and yes, an informed cynicism based on our recent history. They have seen with clear eyes an adult world whose government indulged murder, bribery, lying, pointless war. Since adult behavior teaches the moral values in this country, why punish the children?

The next day, Charlie Peters called me back, pleased with himself. He had a statement from his son, Christian, and he read it to me:

"I agree that there is too much selfishness in society today and would like to see more volunteering. But I'm against universal service because this country is based on the idea that people should be able to decide for themselves what to do with their lives."

Christian Peters is clearly a young man who understands what America is all about. I hope he can pound some sense into his old man. ●

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

● Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, today I join with my colleagues in the House in commemorating the 61st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, celebrated on February 16 by Lithuanians throughout the world.

There is much to learn in the long and troubled history of Lithuania. For nearly 800 years, Lithuania has been a land dedicated to the basic principle of human freedom and to the sacred traditions of the Lithuanian faith, language, and culture.

But modern history has brought Lithuania enormous suffering under oppressive regimes in two world wars. Today, Lithuania continues to suffer under the domination of the Soviet Union.

After World War I, the people of Lithuania demanded from their former German oppressors the right to conduct a congress in order to establish a free Lithuania, and on February 16, 1918, they proclaimed an independent Lithuanian state based on democratic principles.

A permanent constitution was adopted in August of 1922. Guarantees of freedom of speech, assembly, and religion formed the principles of the constitution.

But once again, misfortune intervened. Lithuania was one of the first countries to suffer from the aggression of the Nazis and the Soviet Union. In the face of an ultimatum and the threat of war with Germany, the Lithuanians were forced to cede a portion of their country in March of 1939. Soviet interference quickly followed, and in August of 1940, 18 years after the adoption of its own constitution, Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Government has dominated and controlled the lives of the Lithuanian people, as well as other captive nations, for almost four decades. This ugly denial of human dignity shows itself in too many ways. Families are separated, freedom of speech and religion are limited, and those who dare to speak out against oppression in their native land are exiled or imprisoned. These almost daily deprivations serve as a constant reminder to all of us that the freedom we so often take for granted in America is still denied to millions of men and women throughout the world under Communist domination.

America has an obligation to condemn such conduct. Oppression anywhere threatens the rights and freedoms of people everywhere. We must continue to speak out against the denial of basic human rights, for there is no greater danger to our own freedom than for us to stand by while the freedom we cherish is being denied to others.

As we recognize the struggle of the Lithuanian people, we must also look to our own society and reaffirm our com-

mitment to human rights at home, and not just abroad. We must be willing to examine our own society critically. In this way we can serve as an example to the rest of the world of what a truly open society can be. America has always been a symbol of hope and freedom. As we remember the founding principles of our own land, we remind ourselves that these basic human rights and freedoms which are denied to the people of Lithuania are not just American, but universal.

Mr. Speaker, I am genuinely inspired by the courage and resiliency of the Lithuanian people. For despite their continuous suffering, they have maintained a spirit of independence and pride in their national heritage. And so I join with my colleagues in remembering Lithuania, and in giving Lithuanians throughout the world our strong, outspoken support as they rededicate themselves to the struggle for human freedom in their homeland.●

DONALD LESTAGE, JR.

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Speaker, the strength of our Nation is found in those individuals in towns and cities across America who dedicate themselves to their communities. Donald LeStage, Jr., of North Attleboro, Mass., was such an individual—civic-minded, active in his community, and selflessly concerned for others.

Donald LeStage passed away this month, but his active community service will stand as a lasting tribute to this respected and admired gentleman. I take this moment to share with my colleagues an editorial that was printed in the Sun Chronicle of Attleboro, Mass., concerning this exceptional individual:

DONALD LESTAGE, JR.

Donald LeStage, Jr., will be long remembered for many reasons. His death Sunday at 70 in his native North Attleboro brought sorrow not only to that community that he had served in so many ways, but far beyond it.

He was a prominent figure in the business community as president of LeStage Manufacturing Co., as a past president of the Jewelers Board of Trade, past president of the Boston Jewelers Club, a corporator of the Attleborough Savings Bank, a past director of The Sun Chronicle and an active member of the Manufacturing Jewelers and Silversmiths of America.

The business and industrial activities, extensive though they were, were but one side of this versatile man. He had a special zeal for scouting as evidenced by his having been president of the Annawon Council and by his having been active in scouting since the 1930s, but gave freely of his time and talent to other community activities.

A friend of Mr. LeStage recalled this week that the late civic leader was on hand to help the 1978 United Way campaign in

CXXV—211—Part 3

North Attleboro just as he had helped in so many previous campaigns. A North Attleboro native who had known Mr. LeStage for many years said, "I never heard anything bad about him."

He was an unassuming man whose many contributions to North Attleboro were made without flourish and may well have been taken for granted until people began to think back upon them after his death.

Mr. LeStage's father, who came to North Attleboro in 1901 and founded in 1915 the company that bore his name, also served the community in many ways including as a selectman and as a member of the electric light and water commission.

Donald LeStage built well on good foundation. His accomplishments provided a fitting memorial to him. His family and friends know better than any others how fine a person he was. We hope the memory of how useful and helpful a life he led will be a consolation to them at this time of loss to them and to the community.●

BOYCOTT OF NESTLE PRODUCTS

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, during my past 4 years in Congress, I have become increasingly aware of the hunger and malnutrition afflicting millions of people in Third World countries, and the exploitation of these people by multinational food corporations.

The 252-member governing board of the National Council of Churches recently singled out the Nestle Corp. as one of the most flagrant violators through its promotion of infant formula in the vulnerable Third World countries of Africa, South America, and Asia. The council unanimously endorsed a boycott of Nestle products, charging that direct appeals to Nestle to change its sales promotion of infant formula in developing countries have for the most part been futile.

This boycott is designed to protest the pervasive tactics of the Nestle Corp. to shift mothers in these nations from breast feeding to the use of the corporation's infant formula.

Dr. Michael Latham, professor of international nutrition at Cornell University, recently discussed why Americans should boycott Nestle products. His comments, which should be of great interest to all Members of Congress, follow:

WHY AMERICANS SHOULD BOYCOTT NESTLE PRODUCTS

(By Michael L. Latham)

(Dr. Latham is professor of international nutrition at Cornell University. The following is excerpted from a presentation to the governing board of the National Council of Churches last November.)

I am a physician, a nutritionist and scientist, and have thoroughly reviewed the medical literature on breast and bottle feeding. I am currently involved in research into the issue, and have for over 20 years been writing about it. My interpretation of the scientific evidence leaves absolutely no doubt in my mind first that bottle feeding is a major

cause of morbidity and mortality in developing countries and secondly that the promotion of formulas by corporations such as Nestle has contributed significantly to this most tragic of problems.

I lived for nine years in East Africa working in small hospitals and in large ones, in Tanzania where I directed the Nutrition Unit of the Ministry of Health. I continue to be involved in programs and research projects both in Kenya and in the Philippines. In all of the many developing countries where I have worked, bottle feeding is killing babies. When I see an emaciated, dehydrated, seriously ill baby, and I learn from the mother that he has been bottle fed and that she could have breast fed that baby, I do become emotional. When I find that the mother was persuaded to bottle feed rather than breast feed because of the immoral promotion of infant formula then I do become angry. I wonder how our countries, generous Christian countries, like the United States and Britain and Switzerland can allow this to happen. Yet it is our major food corporations whose directors attend our churches, ones in which we as individuals and institutions invest, and businesses which most of you support with your dollars when you purchase their products.

I have read the Nestle view presented to you, and I have heard their statements, I find that their argument is clever yet largely fallacious. Nestle, like many of the large transnational corporations, can afford millions of dollars to promote their products while appearing to adhere to newly promulgated guidelines, and they can spend huge sums fighting the boycott and producing evidence for you. In contrast, I and other concerned doctors and nutritionists, churchmen and lay workers, get no financial support for our fight to oppose them. All we can do is take a few hours off from our busy schedules to speak out against the actions of the corporations and in favor of our silent constituency, the infants of the poor.

What are the holes in the Nestle argument? Let me deal briefly with three of these.

Nestle states that infant mortality rates have improved in many countries over the last few decades at the same time that bottle feeding has increased. But to conclude from this that bottle feeding has caused, or even contributed to, this decline in infant mortality is statistical nonsense. Clearly, infant mortality rates have dropped because of a host of factors such as improved health care, immunizations, higher standards of living, and so on. Nestle did not show you statistics from, for example, Sweden where breast feeding has dramatically increased and where infant mortality rates are much lower than in the United States.

Nestle says that morbidity data are lacking, and imply that there is not good evidence of an increased disease incidence in bottle fed infants. That is patently untrue. There are dozens of studies, old ones from the first half of this century, and very recent ones, some from Western industrialized countries and others from the Third World that show a much higher disease incidence in bottle fed than in breast fed infants. No scientist or immunologist can deny the fact that human colostrum and breast milk contain substances which confer immunity on the infant and protect him from infections, and that infant formulas do not contain these substances.

Nestle states that "the preponderance of available evidence points to a mother's need, or desire, to work, as the principal reason for the breast feeding decline." Our review of studies from Third World countries and our own work suggests that this is not the case. An analysis of recently published studies from five countries in Asia, Latin

America, Africa and the Caribbean suggests that no more than six percent of mothers in any country said that they gave up breast feeding in order to work.

Inappropriate bottle feeding is a major cause of malnutrition, of diarrhea, and of other diseases in infants in poor communities. The formula is relatively expensive, and so it contributes to worsening poverty. It results in the use by developing countries of scarce foreign exchange to purchase formula. It removes from new mothers a natural method of increasing the spacing of births, and so bottle feeding indirectly contributes to population problems.

Efforts made to influence Nestle to adopt a code of ethics and marketing, that many of us believe are necessary to protect child health, have failed. Because Nestle is a foreign-based company it is not possible for us in the U.S. to force change by using shareholders resolutions and similar efforts which might produce desirable alterations in the practices of U.S. based corporations. Evidence is clear that the Nestle boycott is worrying the company and is beginning to result in policy changes. It is also obvious that Nestle is spending large sums to discredit those supporting the boycott and to try to stop its spread.

A vote by you to support the boycott would provide clear evidence of your solidarity with those deeply concerned for the health of infants in the third world, it would be such a blow to Nestle that it may well tip the balance in favor of their adopting the desirable changes we seek and, finally, it would be a truly Christian act. I am convinced that your vote for this boycott will help to save the lives of innocent victims of bottle feeding in many countries.●

ANDY BIEMILLER RETIRES

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of Andrew J. Biemiller as legislative director of the AFL-CIO marks the end of an era. He has been the warhorse of the American labor movement's lobbying efforts for nearly two decades—a period that has seen the passage of more progressive legislation than during any comparable period of American history.

But Andy Biemiller has been more than just an ordinary lobbyist. He believed in his causes, and he brought to his legislative efforts a strong personal commitment which influenced and inspired those who have worked with him.

I have had the privilege of working closely with Andy for the past 14 years, and I have seen first hand the dedication and thoroughness which he brought to his efforts.

Andy fought for "people" issues—for jobs, health, education, pensions, and senior citizens' programs. He did not see all his dreams fulfilled, nor all his battles won, but he achieved many of his goals and he has laid a strong foundation for the eventual success of the others.

There is no college degree in lobbying, nor is there a required course of preparation. But Andy Biemiller, in the years before he joined the AFL-CIO, had a ca-

reer which uniquely prepared him for the job he did so well. Andy served as a union organizer, a newspaper writer and editor, a State legislator in his native Wisconsin, and finally a Congressman for several terms.

The AFL-CIO and the labor movement will be well served in Andy's successor—his capable assistant for many years, Kenneth Young.

As for Andrew Biemiller, I join my colleagues in expressing my congratulations, my thanks, and my admiration to a truly great American who has left his imprint indelibly on our Nation's legislative scorecard.

I offer him my best wishes for happiness and success in all his future endeavors.●

SUMMER SCREEN

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, in this electronic age when television so greatly affects our lives and the lives of our children, it is worthwhile to acknowledge those television stations which concern themselves with more than garnering mass audience rating points and advertising dollars. Those stations which instead dedicate their efforts to providing high quality programming designed specifically to meet the needs of their local communities deserve our praise.

I am proud to have in my district a television station, KTEH, channel 54 in San Jose, which exemplifies the finest that public television has to offer. With funds provided by its license holder, the Santa Clara County Office of Education, KTEH broadcasts a full daytime schedule of instructional programs to schools throughout the South Bay. Presently, over 30 school districts with more than 100,000 students tune in to KTEH for instruction in language, arts, health, science, career, and consumer education.

Last summer, when California's tax-cut initiative resulted in the cancellation of summer school instruction, KTEH showed its concern for the educational needs of the community's children by instituting a daily, 5-hour, instructional schedule called "Summer Screen."

KTEH has also provided extensive coverage of local and State political events and hosted forums on a variety of public issues. As a part of these forums, KTEH has instituted a special telepodium format which enables viewers to call in specific questions to be presented to speakers on the air. This is a tremendous service to a public seeking information needed to make intelligent political and governmental choices.

Lastly, KTEH has shown itself to be strongly committed to the local development and production of programs which explore the South Bay's wealth of history, theater, music, dance, sports, medicine, and high technology. "The Valley That Was" a documentary about the

Santa Clara Valley in the 1920's and 1930's was named the best local cultural documentary of 1978 by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. The station is presently producing a series of programs on the visual and performing arts of San Jose and the station's locally-produced documentary on pollution in the Earth's ozone layer broadcast last August has been selected by PBS for national distribution. I am proud that KTEH, the South Bay's only public television station, has become a nationwide leader in its field.

Now with the help of pledge drives, corporate underwriting, foundation grants, and other funding, KTEH plans to increase its production of top-quality programs and service to the community.

All those involved in KTEH deserve our praise. I would like to take this opportunity to give special recognition to KTEH president, and county superintendent of schools, Dr. Glenn Hoffman, vice presidents, John Satterstrom, and Ann McCallum Freers, as well as station manager, Maynard Orme. Chief engineer, Robert Whalley, development manager, Nadine Burch, executive producer, Peter Baker, and learning services manager, Peter Craske also deserve our special thanks.●

A REMARKABLE DECREASE IN CRIME

HON. WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. BRODHEAD. I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a unique effort at neighborhood crime prevention by the citizens of a fine neighborhood in the 17th District of Michigan. The people of Crary-St. Mary's Community Council in northwest Detroit have joined together to achieve a remarkable decrease in crime. Their efforts were described in a February 12 story by Jack Kresnak in the Detroit Free Press. I believe that programs such as their "Neighborhood Watch" can be the basis for similar programs in cities throughout the Nation. I commend the citizens of the Crary-St. Mary's community council and the Detroit police department:

NEIGHBORHOOD CUTS CRIME BY HALF

(By Jack Kresnak)

It was no accident that 155 blocks of pleasant middle-class brick homes on Detroit's northwest side recorded the largest drop in crime of any neighborhood in the city last year.

But even residents attending a meeting of the Crary-St. Mary's Community Council last week were amazed when Police Chief William L. Hart congratulated them on these statistics.

Robberies down 47.3 percent, burglaries down 48.2 percent and thefts down 35.2 percent.

All of it due, Hart said, to "ordinary people saying they've had enough and standing together to let criminals know they aren't welcome around here."

Last March, the Detroit Police Department

to use the Cray-St. Mary neighborhood for a unique effort to organize every block into the Neighborhood Watch program.

As an experiment, four officers trained in crime prevention techniques were sent to work full time with the 13,000 residents of the 1.25-square mile area bounded by Grand River, Southfield, W. McNichols and Greenfield.

The purpose, according to Inspector James Humphrey of the Crime Analysis Section, was to see how an intensive effort to organize blocks into Neighborhood Watch programs would affect the area's crime rate.

The officers, working out of the Victory Lutheran Church on Puritan, went door to door on each block, trying to find residents who would sponsor meetings in their homes and become block security captains.

Officer Peter Wesley recalled the day last spring when he nearly passed up a modest brick home with a "For Sale by Owner" sign in the front yard.

Wesley said he went into the home anyway and talked with the owner, an elderly man resentful of the neighborhood's crime problem, for about half an hour. When he came back later that week, Wesley said the for-sale sign was gone and the man volunteered to be the block captain.

Since then, Officers Walter Woodruff, Nelson Scheuer, George Preston and Wesley have helped organize 98 of the 155 blocks into Neighborhood Watch groups.

Jan Williams, president of the Community Council, said the nine-year-old organization had been established to help ease the friction of black integration of a white neighborhood, but that its meetings had become more gripe sessions because no one knew how to cope with crime.

"People felt a lack of control over what was happening," Mrs. Williams said. "Some people almost began to accept crime as a way of life. They didn't realize that they had a right to exist without crime."

The calm, systematic approach of the crime prevention officers helped the residents realize that they could do something positive to fight neighborhood decay, Mrs. Williams said.

That realization became the catalyst for a change in people's attitudes, she said, noting that fewer homes are for sale and property values have started rising.

Neighbors began to get acquainted and to become concerned for the safety of others, such as the elderly living alone.

A softball league sprang up. An application for \$100,000 in neighborhood improvement money was granted. People just became more comfortable with their neighborhood, Mrs. Williams said.

The Cray-St. Mary Community Council not only gained the attention of city hall, it also caught the eye of the Republican Party.

Hart told the meeting that when the GOP convention site selection committee came to Detroit last summer, members wanted to see for themselves the community-police crime prevention program he had told them about.

The committee members were taken by bus to a council meeting being held in the backyard of a woman who was so excited she hung out her rarely used American flag.

Republican committee members were said to have remarked that they had never seen blacks and whites work so well together.

Reported crime throughout Detroit decreased more than 11 percent last year, Hart told his audience, adding he believed the crime prevention program, with citizen cooperation, played a big part in that reduction.

"I think more than anything else, it shows that the people and the police can work together," Hart said. "The Renaissance is not just some buildings downtown."

But, many problems remain.

Mrs. Williams said the organization worried over what to do last summer when a rapist attacked several elderly women.

The group's directors decided to go public, Mrs. Williams said. A police sketch of the suspect and information about his activities were published in the council's newsletter.

Mrs. Williams said the rapist's attacks stopped, although he was not caught.

Residents at the meeting had other complaints for Hart: abandoned cars left unticketed by police, the failure by contractors to live up to their snow removal agreements, juveniles hanging around street corners day and night and kids spray-painting graffiti on garages.

"I've lived in Detroit all my life and I love it," said one elderly woman who said she lived alone and was afraid of youths who had spray-painted her garage.

"I'm getting very discouraged and disgusted and I'm getting to the point where I'm raving," she said, adding that she was so afraid at night that she wore street clothes to bed.

Hart assigned officers at the meeting to investigate complaints. A show of hands indicated citizens felt the curfew for juveniles was not being enforced, so Hart ordered 16th (Grand River) Precinct Commander Charles Sherrill to begin ticketing juveniles caught on the streets late at night.

Mrs. Williams said older persons needed not only a fast response from police but also the security of friendly neighbors to turn to for help.

"A larger community organization offers stability and clout and someone who will help you if you are alone," she said. "We need to maintain a viable hold on the community and to give each other positive reinforcement for what we're doing."

Mrs. Williams said Hart and Humphrey didn't know it but they had "created a monster" because the group intends to demand more and more from the Police Department and other city agencies.

"You'd be surprised how responsive a city official can be when they see their name in our newsletter," she said.

The Cray-St. Mary's project has been so successful that Inspector Humphrey said a similar effort is being made in a small corner of the 15th (Conner) Precinct just north of Mack Avenue—an area with the highest crime rate in the city plus the highest percentage of elderly residents.

Humphrey said a \$160,000 federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration grant will provide free door locks and other security devices for hundreds of homes in the two areas.

Only the homes of elderly people which have received a security survey by crime prevention officers will be eligible, Humphrey said. Workers from the city's central maintenance division are to begin installing the devices free of charge this week.

Some of the money will be used to purchase two vans to provide free transportation for senior citizens in the areas. Humphrey said he hopes to get volunteer police reservists to drive the buses.

"I only wish we had enough money for locks to give to seniors in the whole city," Humphrey said.

STATEMENT ON THE INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO MODIFY CRITERIA RESPECTING CERTAIN SELF-EMPLOYMENT INCOME

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill today which will correct an inequity in the Social Security Amend-

ments of 1977. Under the 1977 act the monthly test for retirement was changed to an annual test. This created a serious problem for farmers selling their crops in the year following their retirement. Farmers in making their usual business plans in November and December found several months later after retiring that their planned retirement was being canceled as a result of the provisions of the 1977 act.

The Senate adopted this legislation last year as an amendment to H.R. 12380, the unemployment compensation amendments. Unfortunately that bill failed to be considered by the conference committee in the crush of last minute business before the Congress adjourned in October 1978. This one-time-only exemption for farmers receiving income from the sale of crops or commodities in the year following their retirement was initially introduced by Senator DOLE and deserves our immediate consideration in remedying this obvious defect in the 1977 Social Security Amendments.●

THE SEVEN POLITICAL SINS OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there are few among us who cannot profit from an occasional exercise in self-analysis, a good hard look in the mirror, so to speak, to determine just where our strengths and, more importantly, our weaknesses lie. In a recent address, my good friend and colleague, Congressman BOB MICHEL, made such an analysis, not just of himself, but the Republican Party as a whole. While his words may have been directed to members of his own party, I feel his sound advice and constructive criticisms would be of interest to many of our colleagues and I would like to include the entire text of Congressman MICHEL's address for their attention.

The text of the address follows:

THE SEVEN POLITICAL SINS OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

There are always plenty of people eager to tell Republicans what is wrong with the Grand Old Party. Editorial writers do it with gusto. Democrats do it all the time. Some prominent columnists must have lower back pain from all of the grave-digging they do over the fate of my Party. Even some historians are recalling what happened to the Whigs, hinting broadly that we Republicans are headed that way.

As the Republican Whip of the House, I find such criticism is a part of life. There are some things to be learned from criticism and unasked-for advice of others.

But most criticism of my Party and most of the gratuitous advice we receive isn't original or all that useful.

We are told we have to "appeal to a broader base" or perish. So what else is new?

We are told that our posture is too negative. But that observation often comes from supporters of the Democrat Party, which has run successfully against Herbert

Hoover and the depression for forty years and is still running against Nixon and Watergate—surely the most impressive display of political negativism in American history.

The trouble with much of this is that the advice and criticism is based on a misunderstanding of what is truly wrong with our Party. It takes a Republican to really know the political sins of his party.

I have therefore put together a list of what I consider to be the seven major sins of my Party. Not all Republicans are guilty of all of these sins all the time. And, needless to say, I have been guilty of a number of them on more than one occasion.

Here, then, in no particular order of importance are the seven political sins of Republicans as I see them.

The first Republican sin is Terminal Gentility. Most of you know I am one of the growing number of Congressmen who have been mugged here in Washington. As harrowing an experience as it was, I've been the subject of other mugging incidents.

For many years, every time I came to the Floor, and criticized some boondoggle of the Democrats, three or four of them have risen and accused me of everything from well-poisoning to breaking and entering. I have been accused of being against the poor many times by Democrats who enjoy accusing Republicans of being soft on poverty, hard on minorities and in general, calloused insensitive heartless wretches.

Republicans on the other hand, sometimes sound as if we are apologizing for criticizing the programs of Democrats. The Congress has become a place where, too often, the Democrats abuse and the Republicans just muse. I'd love to see the Congress once more become a place of hard-hitting and tough sounding arguments, in which Republicans dish it out as well as we have to take it—outnumbered as we are 2 to 1.

And in order for that to happen, we Republicans are going to have to get up off our Lincoln Day dinner clichés and start fighting for what we believe in. And if we don't know what we believe in, we had better find out.

When that is done, the media are going to have to report the fact that Republicans are acting like a party who cares enough to fight. And, parenthetically, the media has an obligation to portray a good, clean, wholesome fight as something more than just a political scuffle between parties. It's absolutely essential to the legislative process.

Nell MacNeill once wrote it as the "Forge of Democracy".

With only one-third of the membership in the Congress, we have a problem "muscling in" for an equal number of blows on the anvil, but we've got to make up for the muscle deficiency with our voices saying something deserving of coverage by the media.

We have to be more militant at the subcommittee level and at the full committee level, as well as on the Floor of the House. Our ranking Republican members have got to display the kind of fighting leadership I know they are capable of.

It is hard, sometimes, to confront that Democrat steamroller in the House. They have the power. They have the big staff. They have the rules. They have the executive branch.

Notwithstanding the odds, we have got to clearly stake out our position in advance on important key issues and not shy away from confrontation.

In the last several Congresses, we have not thrashed out those key issues "in House" or in closed conference, where everyone is free to speak his or her mind as often as we should. And once we have thrashed them out among ourselves, we have a better appreciation for one another's reasons for feeling as

we do about an issue, but, more important, are in a much better position to find a consensus.

The second political sin of Republicans is Galloping Gullibility.

The man who tried to sell the Brooklyn Bridge is probably sorry he never met a Republican. Republicans all too frequently fall for advice that won't do them any good. Whisper in the ear of a Republican that his party should court the vote of left-handed tap dancers, and you can bet that at the next party function, there will be tap dancing on the main table. Obviously, when you have political problems, you are willing to believe almost anyone who promises to give you the secret of success. The trouble with this is that most of the advice is based on theories which sound good, but which, in practice, do not work.

A party does not gain political victory with obvious transparent attempts to "appeal" to one or two, or a hundred special interest groups. A party achieves success when (a) a majority of voters who believe the other guys represent something undesirable, or (b) the party in questions offers hope and credibility.

We Republicans are not going to grow as a party by selling ourselves as something we are not.

Some tell us that Republicans cannot get the black vote. Some tell us that Republicans cannot get the Hispanic vote.

Let me tell you that Republicans can and should get a healthy portion of the vote of any political or social subdivision you care to name—but only if we start acting like a political party with a purpose and not like members of a group therapy session, searching for the right "image" to supposedly "turn on" selected groups.

In the 1978 elections, 47.3% of all those who voted for candidates for the U.S. Senate, the House, or a governorship, voted for Republicans. That's not enough. It's not nearly enough, but it's a far cry from those pre-election polls showing a disparity between the parties of 20 points, or more. If we can get 47.3% in 1978, we can get 53.7% in 1980, by sticking with our traditional Republican positions, Republican issues, and Republican principles. The mood of the country as expressed in the election reflects an affinity for what we have traditionally stood for as a party.

Then, there is the sin of Sloth. It isn't that Republicans are lazier than Democrats, it's just that we don't pounce on opportunities the way the Democrats do. We're just too darned reserved. Every now and then I go down to the House Floor to give what we call a "one-minute" speech on a topic I have found in the morning newspaper. These brief remarks are usually humorous (or at least they are so intended) and usually critical of some aspect of the administration of the Democrat-controlled Congress. I would like to see more Republicans availing themselves of this forum, but actually very few take advantage of this opportunity.

On an even more important issue, even though Republicans were way out front in condemning Carter's energy taxes and his approach to tax reform as contrasted to Kemp-Roth, the Steiger and Archer Amendments, and Conable's alternative to Social Security tax increase, we were never able to exploit the tax rebellion the way it should have been.

Or on the spending issue pre-Proposition 13, and post-Proposition 13.

Credit has to go to the Democrats who quickly regrouped and managed to avoid being outflanked—but that just proves my point. The Democrats are quick to take advantage and quick to see the need to move away from ground they can no longer hold. We Republicans have to develop that skill.

Our fourth sin is Obsession with factionalism. All right, I'll admit it. . . . It seems that if four Republicans get in a room these days, you soon have one calling the other three heretics, one figuring out how to turn the clock back, one other reveling in the number of times he's bolted the party position, and one piously wringing his hands and calling for party unity, while wondering where the nearest exit is. Yes, we have factions, but what political party in all history, in free or totalitarian societies, East or West, has not been faction-ridden?

Years ago, the Democrats solved the problem of factionalism by pretending it didn't exist. They just went on their merry way, marrying up Stevenson with Sparkman, Kennedy with Johnston, and Carter with Mondale, ignoring the shouts and the curses. Most of the time it worked. Eventually the Democrats did, of course, revert to worrying about factions and wound up with George McGovern, the greatest boon to the Republican Party in modern history.

We Republicans ought not dwell on the factionalism problem, but rather point up the important areas where we can all agree.

Media obsession about splintering the Republican Party reached some kind of peak recently when a nationally known columnist, who shall remain nameless, wrote that our Republican Party was about to commit "hara-kiri." The reason this well known pundit thinks Republicans are playing into Jimmy Carter's hands is that we have too many presidential prospects for 1980! Imagine it—we are going to have a large field of Republicans and that supposedly means trouble.

Such things can be believed only by political science majors, prize-winning columnists and other innocents. No party has ever been in trouble because there were too many possible candidates. Parties are much more inclined to get into trouble with only one candidate per faction than they are with a wide variety and range of candidates.

Our fifth sin is Lacklusterism. Some Republican speeches sound as if they were made up of equal parts of Nyctol, the Complete Works of Warren Harding, and the Statistical Abstract of 1926. The Democrats are almost always wrong-headed, but they are wrong-headed with a kind of wild exuberance and admirable zaniness as if they truly believed half of the silly things they say. When a Democrat talks about a bill that will give one of his pet special interests a few hundred million of the taxpayers' dollars, he always sounds as if he is leading a crusade and building the Heavenly City at the same time.

But Republicans simply don't get the feel of the thing. For years and years, Republicans have been warning about the danger of inflation.

Somehow we have talked about this basic economic issue, one that is felt at every dinner table, in every paycheck, in every home in the country, as if it were a dull exercise in higher economics. Unless Republicans remember to talk in the language of the people, we may become the only party in history to "dull" itself to death.

Jimmy Carter became President, not by demonstrating any first-hand knowledge of problems, or reciting statistics to impress reporters. He became President because he charmed people with a rhetorical combination of down-home folk-wisdom, and poetic generalizations. In the words of the old song, Jimmy Carter won with "polka-dots and moonbeams."

Now, I am not saying that we Republicans should—if we could—emulate such an approach. We have to realize, however, that in politics, the way we say something can often be as important as what we say. The textbooks don't treat the subject that way, and that is not the way a lot of us want it to be. But that's the way it is.

On those television talk-shows where media pundits think deep thoughts out loud, you often hear them complain about the gimmicks those of us in politics use to get our names and our programs on the front pages. I think of these complaints every time I see a reporter yawn or mumble under his breath when confronted with a few dozen pages of explanatory material on a complicated bill. Let's face it...How many in the media do the painstaking, tedious work of poring over pages and pages of testimony or background material to research a complex legislative proposal in depth? So, whether any of us like it or not, we Republicans are going to have to match the Democrats in glowing rhetoric and other attention-getting devices.

The sixth sin is fear of negativism.

For all my 22 years in the House, I've been a member of the minority party. When we have had the Presidency, we could join in a positive way to sponsor and affirmatively support legislative proposals of our Administration. The Democrat majority in Congress responded to those proposals with proposals of their own, and were able through sheer weight of numbers to prevail on many occasions.

Without the Presidency, a minority party in the Congress is always up against the wall. We can still propose, but with little likelihood of ultimate success for our legislative proposals.

Since we do have a different approach to some of the key issues, we Republicans have been cast all too frequently as being negative, when in fact we have no other recourse in that kind of situation, but to oppose and fight for our position.

In the last Congress, we have come a long way in establishing ourselves as a credible, worthy opposition party with ideas and proposals of our own.

We have learned how to be selective. When the President was right, we Republicans supported him, as for example on Civil Service Reform, Airline deregulation, and lifting of the Turkish Arms Embargo. He wouldn't have had any one without Republican support.

Where we thought his proposals were bad, we have opposed them outright, or fought hard to modify them.

Yes, we admit to being outright negative on the Carter proposals for new energy taxes, indexing of minimum wages, establishing a new Consumer Protection Agency of government, and a new Department of Education. We also opposed Cargo Preference, Common Situs Picketing, so-called NLRB Reform and National Health Insurance.

We have nothing to be ashamed of in opposing all of these.

And the tax bill became something altogether different with our Republican Amendments.

If we would have had our way on the Budget Resolution, Social Security Amendments, and a Youth differential on minimum wage, G. William Miller and Administration inflation fighters wouldn't have to be floating the suggestions "that the new Congress take another look" at what we wanted to do all along.

In summary, there is nothing wrong in being a naysayer to outlandish spending or ill-conceived legislative proposals. Our Party has no reason to panic just because we have no instant alternative to every Democrat proposal. As Hubert Humphrey used to say, "we have solutions for problems the people haven't even thought about".

Finally, there is the sin of introspection. The very fact that I am making this speech shows how wide-spread this particular sin is among Republicans. We always seem to be contemplating our navels instead of doing our job as best we can. In a sense, this is related to our obsession over factions, but it goes beyond that. We have been conned into

believing that if we only brood a bit more or try to get to the very, very bottom of things, all will be well. We tend to become hypnotized by our own image. We've got to stop all this needless soul-searching and get on with the day-to-day struggle of politics. A healthy political party on the move looks outward, not inward.

Admittedly, we could purge ourselves of all these sins and still not achieve the political success we're seeking. But we Republicans owe it to ourselves to do something about our faults. If we don't, we can be certain they will inevitably cause more damage than they already have.

Needless to add, much of what I have said here is based upon my experience as a Republican Congressman. I am certain that others, looking at the party from different perspectives, would choose other criteria for judging politics and attitudes. But I believe my Congressional perspective, narrow as it is, might help shed some light on problems of the party as a whole.

Let me conclude by saying that even if Republicans were able to purge themselves of these sins, the political landscape would look pretty much the same unless this change is accompanied by media coverage.

Republicans, quite frankly, need the media coverage more than Democrats do. When you have control of every subcommittee and full committee of the Congress, every agency, board and commission and every department of the Executive Branch, you are automatically a newsmaker. News follows power, it's as simple as that.●

NATIONAL STUDENT CONGRESS

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, from March 1 to March 4, 1979, a National Student Congress (NSC) will take place at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia. This gathering will be a unique opportunity for students to discuss major public policy issues of critical importance to our Nation and to develop concrete proposals for public action.

Three to five students from over 200 colleges and universities have been invited to the NSC. To achieve their goals, the Congress will divide into 16 separate committees in order to consider each issue in a thorough manner. Each student will select the committees in which he is most interested and then draw up proposals in that area of concern. They will cover topics that include America and the world, physical resources, the economy, human resources, and government.

The NSC will discuss and adopt means of following up on proposals brought before it. Some possible followup plans include establishing a permanent NSC staff in Washington to engage in the lobbying of Congress; establishing an autonomous student political union at each participating school; and making the NSC an annual event, which would allow the students to express their ever-changing views.

I feel strongly that the National Student Congress will be an opportunity for students to involve themselves in intelligent, responsible consideration of the

policy questions which will be facing them in their lifetimes.

In many respects, the political, economic, and social leadership of a nation is working with young people in mind. We strive to improve our schools, to broaden our opportunities, to upgrade standards of living and working, and to uplift society. We do these things to a large extent, with the future generations in mind.

For the same reason that we strive to improve the lives of future generations, we must also prepare tomorrow's citizens for the political challenges before them. At this time, when apathy is said to be rampant throughout the Nation, our young people need to understand the importance of the decisionmaking process and how citizens can participate in it. Democracy should be a participatory process and people must learn to speak out in ways which are constructive and tolerant of their fellow man.

We need to insure the capability of today's youth to become tomorrow's leaders. This task has never been an easy one. Its difficulties have been considered by philosophers as far back as Aristotle. While the challenge of preparing today's youth continues, the problems with which the world must cope have become increasingly complex.

Man has industrialized, urbanized, and bureaucratized his world into something radically different from the agrarian society which Thomas Jefferson knew. Man has great capabilities; there are few physical limits to what he can do. He must be responsible with such powers, but that is not easy. The National Student Congress at the University of Pennsylvania will help prepare today's youth for the responsibility of leading tomorrow's world.●

IN DETERMINING ECONOMIC POLICY, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD LOOK TO OUR MID-SECTION

HON. DAN GLICKMAN

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are plenty of factors affecting the economic conditions this Nation is facing, and I am convinced they all need to be considered in concert. In some parts of this country, I am glad to say including my own, there is a cooperative spirit that has pulled things together creating a positive and promising economic environment. One of the greatest benefits we can gain from our Federal system is for the Federal Government to learn from successes at the State and local levels. I have a case in point.

Wichita, the largest city in my State of Kansas, has an unemployment rate among the lowest in the Nation, and it is a growth area which should keep things headed the right direction. As we consider economic policies at the national level, I would urge each of my colleagues

and those involved in economic policy within the administration to look at the Wichita experience and to learn from it. Time magazine in its current issue has highlighted the strength of the Wichita economy. I recommend the column to you and submit it for inclusion in the RECORD:

STRENGTH IN THE MIDSECTION

Strength right down the middle is the key to a strong baseball team or military force or national economy. So it might be worthwhile to look at the state of business in the city that by many measures is closest, geographically and spiritually, to the middle of America: Wichita. Rising from the pool-table Kansas wheat fields, surrounded by aerospace plants and enormous grain elevators that ride the prairies like battleships, this community of 262,000 has a problem. There are not enough workers to meet its surging demand.

The number of jobs has risen by more than a third during the 1970s, and unemployment in the past year is down from 4.1% to 2.9%, which is about as low as it can go in America's highly mobile society. (The national average is 5.8%.) Business leaders are eagerly advertising around the country for more skilled workers. If any butcher, baker or engineer wants a job, he or she will have no trouble finding it in this bustling producer of meat, wheat, planes, oil and gas.

Wichita is fortunate because all those businesses are buoyant now. But the community is also typical of many middle-size cities in the rich band between the Mississippi and the Rockies. Tulsa, Oklahoma City, Fort Worth, Austin, Omaha and others are quietly booming, with their unemployment down to the 2½%-3½% range.

They are the beneficiaries of economic diversification and the increasing desire of Americans to settle in cities that, as Beech Aircraft President Frank Hedrick puts it, "are small enough to allow individuals to excel and big enough to give them plenty of room to excel."

Hedrick, 68, whose florid face testifies to years spent in the summer sun and winter winds of Wichita, points out that "this certainly isn't the world's fanciest climate, so we must have other advantages." In his view, one echoed by various local business and labor chiefs: "A work ethic still exists in this part of the world. People feel they have to give a day's work for a day's pay." Local people commonly speak of the city's Midwestern "openness." Says Hedrick: "I was in North Palm Beach the other day, and, hell, you have to be a second cousin to Jesus Christ if you want to play at the Seminole Golf Club. But the social as well as the economic strata are open to anybody who wants to work in Wichita."

More than 160 Vietnamese refugees are doing well working in a local meat packing plant (where employment has doubled in the past four years), and some of them are beginning to start their own small enterprises on the side. Wichita's unemployment rate for blacks, 7.7 percent, is much lower than the nation's average. Women are also getting ahead. Olive Beech, who with her late husband founded Beech Aircraft, is now its chairman (not chairperson), and thus ranks as one of the nation's highest female executives. Wichita's Nancy Kassebaum is the U.S. Senate's only woman member, the city's mayor is Connie Peters.

An admirable boosterism pervades the city. A. Dwight Button, chairman of the Fourth National Bank, boasts that he has hired two senior officers away from Houston banks. Iowa-born Richard Upton, who runs the hyperactive Chamber of Commerce, points to Metropolitan Life, NCR and many other big companies that have opened branches in the area. Tom Pierce, Wichita's AFL-CIO chief, notes that despite its right-to-work law,

Kansas' average hourly wage is fairly high (\$6.11). Says Pierce: "If workers come here and stay for two or three months, you would have a tough time getting them to move out."

Sure there are shortcomings. Housing is scarce. Even the most vocal Wichita cheerleaders admit to a certain provincialism. Bible Belt conservatives have barred the public sale of liquor by the drink. But the city is on a culture kick. In the past decade, Wichita has opened a flying saucer-shaped civic center that dominates downtown, a 12,200-seat coliseum for conventions and cattle shows, one of the nation's better Indian museums, two art museums, a planetarium, a zoo and three new libraries. That hardly makes the community a rival to, say, Chicago. Yet, almost everything is up to date in this Kansas city, and that is a good sign for the nation that surrounds it. ●

THE SMALL SAVER'S ACT—INCENTIVES TO SAVE WILL LEAD TO INCREASED PRODUCTIVITY AND DECREASED INFLATION

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, many of our Nation's economic problems can be attributed to our Nation's low rate of savings.

For example, productivity is hurt by a shortage of private investment in more efficient machinery and in education. Inflation is fueled when we increase our spending on consumer goods faster than the increases in our economy. Finally, interest rates rise to frightening levels when insufficient funds are available for the construction of homes for our Nation's citizens.

The fact is that Americans save only about 6½ cents of every dollar of their disposable incomes. In contrast, Canadians save 10.3 percent, Britons 14.1 percent, West Germans 15.2 percent, and Frenchmen, 17.3 percent, while the Japanese save an incredible 24.9 percent of their disposable incomes.

One major reason for the low rate of savings in our economy is that we simply have not provided sufficient economic incentives to save. Although tax advantages are available for those investing in the stock market or who have earned capital gains, the dividends earned on deposits in savings banks are fully taxable—from the very first dollar paid out. The sad fact is that when passbook interest rates are barely equivalent to the rate of inflation, the small saver is rarely ahead of the game, and is often at a financial disadvantage after taxes are paid. No wonder he does not save. But incentives for saving can and should be provided.

I have recently introduced H.R. 2338, the Small Savers' Act of 1979, which would go a long way toward renewing the economic incentive to save. This bill provides that the first \$800 of dividends earned each year could be excluded by a taxpayer from his gross income. Income from dividends paid by a domestic sav-

ings and loan association, bank, credit union, or similar institution would be eligible for the exclusion.

H.R. 2338 was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, where I hope it will receive quick action. Our Nation's economy cannot stand a continuation of our recent low rate of savings—we must provide the economic incentive of a limited tax break for small savers.

Mr. Speaker, to afford my colleagues an opportunity to review this proposal, I ask that the full text of H.R. 2338 be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

H.R. 2338

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income \$800 of interest on savings in the case of an individual taxpayer

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Small Savers' Act of 1979".

SEC. 2. (a) Part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items specifically excluded from gross income) is amended by redesignating section 124 as section 125 and by inserting after section 123 the following new section:

"SEC. 124. INTEREST ON SAVINGS.

"(a) EXCLUSION.—In the case of an individual, gross income does not include amounts received as dividends or interest on deposits or withdrawable accounts in a domestic savings and loan association, bank, credit union, or similar thrift institution.

"(b) LIMITATION.—The exclusion allowed under subsection (a) shall not exceed \$800 for any individual for any taxable year."

(b) The table of sections for such part III is amended by striking out the item relating to section 124 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 124. Interest on Savings.

"Sec. 125. Cross references to other Acts."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this section of this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1978. ●

COMPLAINTS AND COMMENTS REGARDING HEW GRANTS

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I hereby submit for the RECORD complaints and comments regarding HEW activity in my district. This is to support action taken to secure answers and necessary corrective steps through HEW, GAO, and other appropriate authorities. The letters follow:

GENTLEMEN: I am writing you regarding the Southeast Idaho Family Medical and Educational Services, Inc. (SIFMES). In 1975 this organization began its operation in Southeast Idaho with its headquarters in Pocatello and under the leadership of Dr. Sam Romeo of Pocatello. It gave as its primary reason for existence the fact that it was needed to "increase health care services to rural Southeast Idaho" and "to bring primary medical care to previously underserved populations".

The truth of the matter is that such "rural underserved areas" did not exist when

SIFMES came to the area, and they do not exist now. SIFMES has come to some of the communities in the area and established small clinics with their own salaried doctors and administered by unqualified personnel. These clinics were moved into the area without consultation with or approval of private doctors in the area. They were moved into two of the most wealthy and productive counties in Idaho. One is in Soda Springs, and one is in American Falls; both communities have adequate hospitals and private physicians. One clinic is in Lava Hot Springs, which is a rapidly growing resort town and is within easy driving distance of Pocatello. One is in McCammon which is in easy driving distance of Pocatello. The physicians in the clinic in Soda Springs freely admit that their percentage of collections is only 41 percent. Private physicians in the area cannot possibly continue in business at this low collection rate. SIFMES claims that in three years it will be totally independent and will need no subsidization from anyone, including the federal government. This can only come about if it brings the private physicians to financial ruin while SIFMES is still operating under a federal grant.

SIFMES also claims to be actively engaged in operating other plans as follows:

1. Migrant health care.—There is little, if any, indication that there has been activity in this area of medical service by SIFMES even though they received a grant for it. Prior to SIFMES private physicians were giving adequate service in this field on a fee for service basis.

2. Immunization Program.—This service was and still is adequately taken care of by the Public Health service of the State of Idaho.

3. Adolescent Health Care.—This service has been refused by the three School Boards in Caribou County, and quite probably elsewhere.

4. Mental Health.—This has been very adequately managed by private physicians.

It becomes quite obvious that the goal of SIFMES is not a self-righteous attempt to serve the poor, sick and neglected people in medically underserved areas out in the bushes of Southeast Idaho. They are out for the Almighty Dollar.

Because SIFMES appears to me to be a very serious threat to the established private physicians and the citizens of Southeast Idaho, I request that your office investigate this group and its activities very thoroughly. I recommend that such an investigation should include how, where, and why they were allowed to incorporate. With so many obvious discrepancies in their statements of need for their services and the actual need, is there any need for their existence as a business in Idaho? Why are they classed by I.R.S. as a non-profit organization and allowed to operate tax free?

I will appreciate any action you choose to take in this matter.

Very truly yours,

FEBRUARY 9, 1979.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HANSEN: I have been especially concerned about the Health, Education and Welfare grant to the Idaho Migrant Council for the establishment of a care facility in the Blackfoot area for migrant workers. This is especially distressing to me, since the first hearing of the grant application resulted in a negative decision on the basis of the testimony offered by the Blackfoot Health Care professionals, which included testimony by physicians, hospital administrators of Bingham Memorial Hospital, and the District Health Department office located in Pocatello. There were many areas in the grant application which were very questionable in accuracy and this was pointed out at that hearing. It was most dis-

treassing to us all, when we learned that the grant had been finally and arbitrarily granted at a later date. It is especially distressing since there was no further hearings on the application.

I certainly do not feel that the Blackfoot area is a medically underserved area. There are nine full time practicing physicians located in Blackfoot. In addition, there are daily physician visits by a radiologist group from Idaho Falls. There are regular consultations by a urologist, pathologist, and orthopedic surgeon as needed. In addition, there is a full time emergency room physician, which staffs our emergency room (in house) 24 hours a day from Fridays at 5 p.m. until Sundays at 5 p.m. This 48 hour period represents a full time physician equivalent. In addition, there are two public health service physicians in Fort Hall.

Our hospital has an emergency room which is open 24 hours per day with physician coverage 24 hours per day. The laboratory and x-ray facilities of Bingham Memorial Hospital are likewise covered 24 hours per day. There is a well established and smooth functioning emergency medical transport service system available, which can transport patients from any area in the county to a physician within thirty to forty-five minutes. The roads in our area are good and almost never are closed due to inclement weather. In addition, two population centers at opposite ends of our county (Shelley and Aberdeen) are much closer to medical facilities by virtue of their proximity to Idaho Falls and American Falls where medical service is also available.

In view of the above situation, I see no way that this area can be considered medically underserved. I, therefore, request the assistance of the office of Congressman Hansen in investigating the roll of Federal Health Grants in Eastern Idaho in relation to the medical and health needs, appropriateness of grants expenditures and budget reality within the grant, effect on the quality of the health care delivery system, effect on the dominant private practices system of health care delivery and effect on the stability of the health care system and resultant possible deleterious effects on the quality of care available without federal subsidy.

I would appreciate your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

FEBRUARY 9, 1979.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HANSEN: The following is a rough abstract of the significant items of concern established by approximately thirty physicians from Eastern Idaho who met with the common interest of concern of wasteful use of federal dollars of HEW and other federal grants as related to Southeastern Idaho at this time. Physicians present included representatives from American Falls, Blackfoot, Pocatello, Downey, Preston, Soda Springs, Grace, and Montpelier. The general attitude, it was felt by all, represented certainly a majority vote of all the private practicing physicians in Southeast Idaho. Some concerns were the following.

The documented need of much of the grants was of questionable validity. It appeared to many that liberal overestimations were made in some areas of economic interests; the number of health migrant workers estimated was felt to be highly excessive for this area; the health migrant workers in this area are largely illegal aliens, and the question of the status of their availability to the health system in question was unclear. This is particularly true in case of the federal, state, and local governments recently denying hospitalization and treatment for an illegal alien migrant worker who was severely injured in this area during the past year.

The migrant worker grants were cost-conflicting; the grants on Twin Falls and Black-

foot were obtained with insufficient or no hearings and with insufficient data and with no clarification as to how the goals of the grant will be accomplished. There was general concern regarding the evident adverse effect upon the present excellent health system in Eastern Idaho and the adverse effect upon the infusion of large amounts of federal funds as related to individual practitioners who have expressed a desire to settle in some of the smaller communities in Eastern Idaho but have been discouraged to do so and make this their place of living because of the heavy investment of HEW funds in a manner such that the competition between a newly established private practitioner of medicine and someone with heavy federal grants is not economically feasible, even though the patient pays out of pocket the same amount per visit.

The physician's visit per grant as identified by SIFMES was over \$50.00 per visit in addition to the patient's charge. If calculated by using HEW funds as the total cost per patient visit, this exceeds \$100.00 per patient visit. These are identified as encounters in the grants, not as physician visits. The encounter also includes any contact with the patient in the office with the exception of a telephone call regardless, whether this be by the nurse, the physician, instructions, etc. Each encounter is calculated on the above costs.

It was felt by those who are living in the communities where the SIFMES outreach program is in effect that the number of encounters or physician visits listed in the SIFMES literature should be questioned as being exaggerated. Deep concern was expressed by all parties as to the validity of response to emergency room calls and 24-hour calls by the family practice personnel in the smaller communities. It was felt that they are not doing what the grant said and not doing what the public was told would be done.

The utilization of hospital beds in the small communities by the family practice personnel is extremely minute compared to the utilization by private practitioners. This would lend additional support to the minimal amount of patient management that is being done as compared to private practitioners.

It was felt by many that the dollar figure for physician salaries given in the SIFMES proposal as well as the dollars for malpractice appeared to be inflated, and several stated that conversations with physicians employed by SIFMES in these areas received much less salary than the stated amount in the grant.

It was unanimously felt that the descriptions of the area as to its needs, geography, communication, transportation, and interrelation within the present health system as described by SIFMES was far from valid and exaggerated heavily in favor of obtaining a grant. There was no indication that HEW had made any effort to identify the validity of many of the claims being made by SIFMES. It was felt that the progress reports of SIFMES to HEW were overstated in favor of SIFMES, particularly areas that stated that SIFMES was a cohesive force in the area between many health organizations and health practitioners, whereas indeed the opposite is very dramatically true, and the reputation of SIFMES with health professionals, the state health department and others is very questionable.

Progress reports state that Dr. Romeo was placed in the position of the director of the local health department because of the great trust the health community had upon his capability, where in reality he was unilaterally released by the health department without notice on July 10, 1978, and there is no record that SIFMES had notified HEW of this change of stance.

It was pointed out that three new physicians have been in Bear River recently, and

that this general area of Montpelier and Soda Springs no longer fulfills the HURA grant needs. However, these grants are continuing and being added upon. In American Falls, the University of Utah, a nonprofit corporation which has had three private practitioners in the area and had been competing successfully against the federal, state, and county infusion of dollars into SIFMES, has been successful. The practitioners have continued to carry the community's support and are taking care of the majority of the community needs. The records indicate that there were only nine hospital admissions by SIFMES during the past several months and that three of these were at night and indeed admitted by the private practicing physicians because SIFMES personnel were not available. At the present time, the American Falls SIFMES group which is now under a Kellogg grant is being refunded under a HEW grant. During the past few months the three physicians in private practice at American Falls has been reduced to two by increasing pressures of publicly and grant funded physicians who practice without any overhead or economic responsibility on their own and yet charge the patients the same amount per office visit. This is a clear indication of unnecessary expense of federal dollars driving out private sector and leaving an unstable health situation. The same potential situation is existing in Downey and Soda Springs.

Several specific items arose which were discussed about which I am sure you will receive further data. Some of these items specifically are fallacious descriptions of the communication and road system in Eastern Idaho which resulted in grant for renting of two four-wheel vehicles and of grant for obtaining airplane service into certain communities. The description of the medical service and quality of medical care in this area in some of the SIFMES documents is also of very doubtful validity, and there is no indication that HEW made any effort to evaluate the claims of SIFMES prior to establishing grants.

Deep concern was expressed over the inter-office memos of HEW which openly criticized SIFMES's basic integrity and ability to handle the grants and yet within a few short weeks allowed substantial additional grants.

It was felt that the Mental Health grant and the Adolescent Health grant are two grants that should not be given to SIFMES because of a lack of expertise in these areas and because of the absence of need of these grants. Both of these grants utilize personnel who are less qualified than in the private sector, provide organized input of new patients into the family practice arena in a rather direct manner, and at the direct expense of the private sector of medicine, thereby dramatically increasing the cost of medical care for unnecessary services which are paid by the elaborate influx of federal dollars and contributing to instability in the supply of physicians in this area and strongly discouraging individual practitioners, several of whom have expressed a desire to settle in smaller areas in Eastern Idaho.

It was felt that the mechanisms of using HEW through SIFMES as a direct feedline into a new private for-profit clinic with the two profit stockholders being on the Board of Directors of SIFMES was deplorable use of public funds to establish and develop the private clinic with the use of federal dollars. This is felt to be quite typical of the apparent willingness of HEW to provide grants with minimal or no evaluation other than that developed by the applicant. Furthermore, other physicians and health care organizations in the area have not been given an opportunity for input on grant applications and their effect on health care in the area, other than in very limited amounts when this appeared fortuitously through

the mechanisms of the Council of Governments.

These are some of the major and minor areas about which you will probably receive further correspondence.

Very truly yours,

Addendum: One of the major items of concern is the continuing deleterious effect of the present federal infusion of dollars upon the present excellent private sector medical system which has developed and which takes care of most of the majority of patients in this area. This system will be further eroded with continued massive infusion of federal dollars and will leave a hiatus of quality of medical care in the community. Evidence of this is already developing in the satellite areas as mentioned above. The benefit of the public and patients should be considered as top priority rather than the continued granting of federal dollars.

FEBRUARY 12, 1979.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HANSEN: After reviewing the data between Family Practice Unit, SIFMES, and the HEW, it is most appropriate at this time that the assistance of the office of Congressman George Hansen be requested in investigating the role of federal health grants in Eastern Idaho, in relation to medical and health needs, appropriateness of grants, expenditures and budget reality within the grants, the effect on the quality of health care delivery system, the effect on the dominant private practice system of health care delivery, and the effect on the stability of the health care system and resultant possible deleterious effects on the quality of care available without federal subsidy.

Very truly yours,

FEBRUARY 20, 1979.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HANSEN: I have been greatly concerned for some time with the course of events which have been transpiring in southeastern Idaho medical practice. I feel that I have a better insight on these matters than the average physician now practicing in this locality because I was raised in the Lava Hot Springs area and went to high school there, attended Idaho State University for pre-medical education and have been back practicing in this community since early 1950. I am greatly concerned in what has been happening in the Pocatello, Bannock County, Caribou, Power County areas in recent years. I believe we need your assistance as a U.S. Congressman from this district to investigate the role of Federal Health Grants in this area. Many physicians are becoming increasingly alarmed at the encroachment of federal health care in competition to private health care and delivery by private fee for service physicians. We are actually now being competed with federally funded programs of very questionable merit which have been granted by the Department of Health and Welfare. With this recent acquisition of more information that has come out of the Seattle office of Health and Welfare it is very alarming to see the great waste of federal funds and continuing granting of federal grants that are entirely unnecessary and unneeded. I believe that this unnecessary waste of money has got to be cut off. It is not doing what it was supposed to do and in turn is also not needed. I shall try to show some of the most glaring examples of waste that have been occurring in recent years.

The grants that have been issued for Health, underserved rural areas. Two of the main areas concerned in this area of grants are the communities of American Falls and Soda Springs, Idaho. Both of these medium sized rural communities actually have adequate physicians based in their local areas at the present time and no further federally subsidized medical clinics or groups are ac-

tually needed. In American Falls one privately funded physician supplier has had to let a physician go recently because there was not enough need for his services in this community. Soda Springs is adequately staffed with physicians and no further federally subsidized programs are needed. The two federally subsidized physicians who are working in the Soda Springs area have only meager professional backgrounds with only one year of post-graduate education. This is a very meager medical background to go into rural communities and set yourself up as a specialist in all fields of medicine as a great many family practitioners do.

The grants for adolescent health services and mental health linkage were entirely not warranted and are a total waste of money. These grants were not recommended by the local medical societies of southeastern Idaho or Bear Lake Counties but were granted regardless of our recommendation to SIFMES and in turn to the Family Medical Center. The hospitals in both American Falls and in Soda Springs have not benefited one single bit from the influx of these federally sponsored programs in their community. Approximately ten to fifteen percent of hospital admissions are coming from the Family Practice Group. They are not using the local hospitals in these communities! It is noted that in the Pocatello Free Clinic which was largely staffed by local physicians years ago that the Family Medical Clinic has been paid to render service to the Pocatello Free Clinic and in turn has largely supplied physicians assistance for this service. These people are not medical doctors or physicians and only can render very basic care. The private physicians have been donating their time to this free clinic but in turn the federally sponsored program is being paid or subsidized in sending second rate medical help to this free clinic. It has also been noted that Dr. Sam Romeo, for a short time, enjoyed the appointment as a Medical Director or Supervisor to the Southeastern Idaho Health Department. This appointment was only shortlived and was either months or at best only a few weeks in duration but to our knowledge has never been deleted from information that the Family Medical Center or SIFMES is putting out information that would indicate that probably Dr. Romeo is still employed by the Southeastern Idaho Health Department. This is entirely an erroneous type of misleading information. It is also noticed and recorded that patient encounters that the SIFMES and Family Medical Center group use for applying for further extension of their grants include any type of patient encounter that might be made such as a walk-in patient, an immunization clinic that is run by the Health Department, telephone calls or anything to pad the score board so to speak.

At the same time as all this is going on in Bannock, Caribou and Power Counties, we are now faced with an Idaho Migrant Council Clinic opening in Blackfoot, Idaho. This is probably another federal medical waste of funds as it has been shown and well documented what occurred in the Caldwell, Nampa, Homedale area years ago. In Caldwell we had two competing Migrant Council and Migrant Worker Clinics started in that area which had staffs of five to seven people and for years only saw ten patients a day. This was totally unnecessary in these communities. It was not wanted by the local medical group. These migrant workers are being taken care of in local medical offices. In spite of propaganda by SIFMES and Family Medical Clinic that Migrant Workers are not seen by private physicians for various reasons, this is an absolute, downright untruth. I know this to be a fact because I have been taking care of Migrant Workers for 20 years in this community.

It is very discouraging to see programs of great waste, unwanted and totally unnecessary being funded by agencies of the Federal Government that know nothing of the medical needs of these communities that are being totally directed by newcomers within this community who have very poor knowledge of what really is happening in the outlying areas. I believe we need your help as a well-informed person who has actually lived in this area for most of your life and understand the problems which exist in southeastern Idaho to look into these matters and do everything possible to start turning around this totally unwarranted and horrible waste of federal tax dollars.

Very sincerely yours.●

ADVERSE CIVIL SERVICE RULINGS

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am again proposing legislation that would provide civil service retirement credit to particular contractor-furnished technicians who have been unjustly denied their benefits because of adverse Civil Service rulings.

It is important that I take some time to examine the historical factors underlying this legislation. Due to the shortage of technicians in the years following World War II the Federal Government acquired the services of skilled technical personnel through contracts with private companies. While these technicians were paid by the Government, they were recruited by these private contractors. They were known as contract technician service personnel (CTSP) and worked mostly for the Armed Forces. The Government kept up this practice through the 1950's and into the 1960's.

In 1963 the House Post Office and Civil Service questioned the legality of CTSP contracts, and a decision issued by the Comptroller General's office in 1965 held that the contracts were in fact illegal. Thus, making the CTSP job illegal.

The result in this decision was to give CTSP the opportunity to change to Federal service including their jobs. No problems arose in the conversion, the last one taking place in 1967. However, since several of these people have reached retirement age, a problem has developed. They have discovered that the Civil Service Commission refuses to count their service as CTSP in fixing their retirement benefits.

The events leading to their hiring and type of work, together with the contrary and complicating policies of the Federal Government, all lead to the belief that these personnel have been denied their retirement benefits. In addition this denial is inconsistent since precedents have been set in several court cases.

On the human side of the coin, the situation remains that the denial of retirement benefits has had a grave effect on the retirement income of individuals who have spent their entire careers in service to the Federal Government. These people could not carry their pri-

vate pension plans to the Federal retirement system and they could only accumulate the minimum amount of civil service retirement credit after they made the switch. I feel that these individuals have been placed in an untenable position through no fault of their own and merit their status corrected.

I am proposing a bill that would allow only those under contract before March 4, 1965, to receive additional civil service credit for the years they spent as CTSP. Those wishing to receive this additional benefit would have to pay the amounts they would have paid into the system had they been eligible for Federal retirement annuities in the beginning. Those wanting complete Federal coverage would have to give up their social security benefits for that period of coverage, and the amounts the person paid into the social security system would be transferred to the Federal retirement fund to reduce the contributions that former CTSP would be obligated to do in order to receive their additional credit. Another important provision requires a dollar-for-dollar reduction for any amount CTSP receive from private pension plans based on their CTSP service. This is to make sure that the legislation provides benefits solely to those for whom CTSP service has caused hardship and to prevent anyone from receiving greater retirement benefits than those available to Federal workers.

I am not exactly sure what the cost of my proposal would be but I understand that roughly 2,000 persons are affected; thus making the cost appear small.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is not to open up the doors of the civil service retirement system to those who in any way worked for the Government in the past. Its intention is to right a wrong that has punished a small group of people who have served the Federal Government and the Nation.●

RETIREMENT OF E. GENE FURNACE

HON. DOUGLAS APPLEGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure for me to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives the celebrated retirement of an outstanding individual and long-time friend, Mr. E. Gene Fournace.

Mr. Fournace, retiring as senior vice-president of the Ohio Power Co., Canton, Ohio, vice president of the Franklin Real Estate Co., New York, N.Y., and vice president of the Ohio Electric Co., has been employed by Ohio Power for nearly 50 years in one capacity or another. He also serves as a director to the American Electric Power Service Corp.

Education in the Canton, Ohio public school, Mr. Fournace went on to receive his B.A. degree at the University of Wisconsin in 1930 and attended the Univer-

sity of Pennsylvania and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1950 and 1961, respectively. He is respected and admired by his associates as an individual who is more familiar with the utility business than anyone.

But Mr. Speaker, this gentleman's dedication does not end with his vocation. Mr. Gene Fournace has dedicated his life to public service groups of all kinds. Since 1932 when he served as president of the Newark, Ohio, Jaycees, Gene has been a most active and concerned citizen. He was the first recipient of the "Outstanding Young Man of the Year Award" by the Newark, Ohio, Jaycees, chairman of the Lima, Ohio, Community Chest campaign, chairman of the Governor's Executive Committee on Ohio Water Resources, a director of the Water Resources Congress, and chairman of the Ohio Public Expenditure Council just to name a few of his positions.

Yes, Mr. Gene Fournace is a rare individual, and this is unfortunate as we could use more people like him in this country. On behalf of Ohio's 18th Congressional District, I wish to thank Gene for his dedication and hope that his retirement brings him happiness and the rest he deserves.●

DRAFTING PEOPLE OR DOLLARS

HON. JAMES P. (JIM) JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, as discussion and debate involving the question of re-instituting the draft continue here in Washington and throughout the Nation, it is important to understand some of the basic issues involved. Peter J. Ognibene, a military and political affairs writer, contributed a column on this subject that appeared in the February 13, 1979 issue of the Washington Post. Mr. Ognibene makes a number of interesting points concerning the volunteer force and why it may be the desired option in a time of peace. I ask that the article be reprinted in the RECORD.

The article follows:

DRAFTING PEOPLE OR DOLLARS?

(By Peter J. Ognibene)

There are two ways to raise an army. The nation can draft its young into service, or it can use another form of conscription—taxation—to pay for a volunteer force.

Throughout most of our history, we have chosen the latter, more democratic approach. Nevertheless, sentiment and support for the draft appear to be rising on Capitol Hill.

Conscription has a long if inglorious history. The British Navy impressed 10,000 native-born Americans between 1793 and 1811, an outrage that led to the War of 1812. Throughout the 19th and well into the 20th century, immigrants by the millions sought the safety of these shores to keep their sons from being dragooned into the perennially warring armies of Europe. Until the Cold War, Americans regarded the draft as a last resort that could be justified only when the nation was in imminent peril.

The draft was abolished in 1973. To make the armed forces more attractive employers, Congress authorized higher pay, reenlistment bonuses and other incentives. Although the volunteer force does not work perfectly—what in government does?—it has performed far better than its critics prophesied.

In spite of predictions to the contrary, the quality of military recruits has improved since the draft ended. All prospective enlistees are assigned to one of five "mental categories" on the basis of aptitude tests. The law prohibits recruitment of the bottom 10 percent (Category V) but permits each service to draw up to 18 percent of its recruits from Category IV, which encompasses the 10th through 30th percentile. Over the past five years, the services have drawn only 7.4 percent of their recruits from Category IV.

The Army, which many thought would be unable to remain beneath the 18 percent ceiling, has confounded the pessimists. Only 11 percent of the Army's recruits have come from Category IV over the past five years.

More than a fourth of the Army is black; critics find that a cause for concern. The demise of the draft, however, appears to have had less to do with the rise of black enlistments than the skyrocketing unemployment rate of black teen-age males. Relatively few young blacks have been able to find good jobs in the domestic economy.

This is not so much an Army "problem" as it is a reflection on the trades, businesses and professions of America. With these routes of upward mobility closed to many blacks, they have been turning in greater numbers to an institution that has long welcomed them. In the Army, many of them will gain additional education, useful job skills and a rewarding career.

When "equal opportunity" becomes a reality in the civilian economy, black representation in the Army will probably decline to a level close to their proportion of the population. To revive the draft now would only serve to limit the number of blacks who would be allowed to volunteer for the Army.

It costs more to recruit volunteers than it does to induct reluctant civilians, but the actual savings are small by Pentagon standards.

Rep. Les Aspin (D-Wis.), a member of the House Armed Services Committee, calculates that "the cost of the all-volunteer raise in 1977 came to \$1.7 billion." That accounted for about a sixth of the boost in military pay; the lion's share (five-sixths) went to more senior military personnel.

If there were a new draft, the Department of Defense estimates it would save about \$500 million in recruitment costs—about \$2 for every man, woman and child in America. The only way to save more money would be to slash military pay for all ranks, and Congress shows no inclination to take such a step.

In response to a congressional query, Secretary of Defense Harold Brown said recently that any new legislation to register young men for the draft should also be extended to include young women. As a matter of equity, it would be hard to argue against a unisex draft. American voters, however, might not take too kindly to the prospect of having their daughters as well as sons shipped off involuntarily to boot camp.

Few members of Congress are advocating that conscription be immediately revived; their present objective is the registration of 18-year-old males. With such a system in place, however, it would be a short step to actual inductions.

With some two million men and women currently in uniform, it is difficult to imagine the nation suddenly in need of millions more. Moreover, in this age of computers, registration would be much less a problem

than the training and equipping of a massive influx of recruits. So, one could hardly plead logistical necessity in behalf of a so-called standby draft.

The real issue, of course, is money. The draft is a serious deprivation of liberty that can only be justified when the service of some must be conscripted to preserve the freedom of all. With the United States at peace, the case for a new draft rests primarily on how we will pay for our peacetime armed forces. The choice, in fact, is quite simple: We can draft dollars, or we can draft people. ●

UNITED STATES USE OF BASE FACILITIES IN SPAIN

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues some correspondence I had with the State Department regarding newspaper reports which indicated that the Government of Spain had denied permission for U.S. F-15 aircraft on their way to Saudi Arabia for display purposes to land in Spain for refueling. Current treaty relations with Spain assure us of certain transit rights.

According to the State Department the Washington Post article of January 30, 1979, and other reports were inaccurate. They indicate that time pressures did not permit the United States to wait for a Spanish decision on the transit question.

A copy of the Washington Post article and my correspondence with the State Department follows:

USE OF BASES MAY BECOME THORNY ISSUE FOR UNITED STATES, SPAIN

(By Miguel Acoca)

MADRID, Jan. 29—A bit of diplomatic foot-dragging by Spain during the height of the Iran crisis has signaled that the United States can no longer take for granted stop-over rights at Spanish air bases for U.S. warplanes on their way to Middle East trouble spots.

Spain's reluctance to allow U.S. F15s bound for Saudi Arabia to land at Torrejon air base outside Madrid caused an expensive rerouting through Lajes, a base on Portugal's Azores Islands, with midair refueling.

The incident underlined the differences between Spain and the United States that threaten to weaken the 25-year-old military relationship between the two countries.

Spanish policy and attitudes raise serious questions about whether the United States can use the Spanish bases to supply Israel in the event of another Middle East war, for example, or to help Saudi Arabia in the event of trouble in that kingdom so rich in vital petroleum.

Spain actually refused to allow U.S. planes resupplying Israel in 1973 to land at the bases—Spain does not recognize Israel and has cultivated the Arab states. However, U.S. air tankers from Torrejon did fly repeated missions in 1973 refueling planes from the United States airlifting weapons to Israel.

Spain's apparent unhappiness with this situation stems from the fact that Washington and Madrid have conflicting Middle

East policies and differences of opinion over whether developments like the current crisis in Iran actually involve the defense of the West.

The irony of the U.S. use of Lajes earlier this month was evident. After the 1974 leftist Portuguese military revolution—which caught the CIA and the Nixon administration by surprise—U.S. officials were convinced that the Azores base could never be used, as it had in 1973, for Middle East conflicts. That conclusion proved wrong.

At the height of Washington's fears that Portugal was coming under communist influence or control, a high U.S. official in Madrid remarked, somewhat optimistically, that Washington did not really need Portugal or Lajes.

"Portugal makes no difference," he said. "We've still got Iran, Spain, and West Germany."

Despite the changes in Portugal, however, Lisbon now permits the U.S. Air Force to use Lajes for vital missions.

Portugal, a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, views events in the Middle East and U.S. interests differently than Madrid. And it now has overcome the exclusion from key NATO committees imposed by former secretary of state Henry Kissinger, who did not trust Portugal's leftist leaders.

The apparent end of Iran's close cooperation with the United States gives Spain a new strategic importance, but the role of Spain and the Spanish bases remain in question.

U.S. officials maintain that under the five-year bases treaty, which expires in 1981, the United States has "unlimited transit rights" for planes headed for third countries. Iran and the shah were the beneficiaries of these rights when the Torrejon base was used as a stopover for planes bearing weapons for the Iranian armed forces. Spain raised no objections at the time.

Exactly what happened regarding transit rights for the F15s is not clear. U.S. officials put in a routine request with the Foreign Office. At first the answer was affirmative.

Then it was announced in Washington that the planes were going to Saudi Arabia for political reasons concerning Iran. Madrid promptly withdrew approval even though the flight involved three friendly governments—the United States, the shah and the Saudi government.

"We didn't want to be taken for granted," explained a Spanish official.

"Perhaps we should have consulted a friend about the mission of the F15s, an American source said. 'We used them [the Spanish bases] in 1973, and we should save them for a crucial moment.'"

The fact remains, however, that the incident over the F15s set a precedent. The American interpretation of "unlimited transit rights" is now an issue that will be raised if there is a new Middle East crisis and when a new bases agreement is negotiated in coming months.

While it is true that Premier Adolfo Suarez faces an electoral campaign in which the U.S. treaty may become an issue, Socialists and Communists agree that the alliance with the United States must be continued so as not to upset the balance of power in Western Europe. They oppose Spain joining NATO, however.

Apart from a different concept of Western defense and conflicting strategic views on the Middle East, Spain feels that it can extend its influence in the Arab world as U.S. standing drops. Spain's "special role" in the Arab world was a foreign policy cornerstone of the late dictator Francisco Franco. It remains the same under the nascent democracy of King Juan Carlos.

COMMITTEE ON
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
January 31, 1979.

HON. CYRUS R. VANCE,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I would like to know if recent press reports are accurate that the Government of Spain refused to allow United States F-15 aircraft bound for Saudi Arabia to land in Spain.

Specifically, I would like to know the following:

Was it reasonable to expect, on the basis of our treaty with Spain, that such flights would be allowed to land?

Are we meant to have unlimited transit rights in Spain?

When did we ask for landing permission and when was permission refused and why was it refused?

When asking for permission, did we tell the Spaniards the mission of the planes?

How far in advance of departure of the aircraft from the United States did we seek Spain's permission?

Do you consider this refusal in any way a violation of the spirit or the letter of agreements or understandings with the Spanish Government?

Was the denial of landing rights related to the fact that the F-15 mission was made public? Or, in other words, do you have reason to believe that the planes could have landed if the mission had been kept out of the press?

I appreciate your consideration of these questions and would like an unclassified reply within two weeks.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Europe
and the Middle East.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C.

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HAMILTON: I refer to your letter of January 31, 1979, to Secretary Vance in which you requested information on the use of Spanish bases by United States F-15 aircraft during the recent deployment to Saudi Arabia.

Press reports which stated that the Spanish Government refused to allow F-15's bound for Saudi Arabia to land in Spain are inaccurate. In fact, the Spanish did not object to a stopover of the planes in Spain. In view of widespread press coverage of the deployment, the Spanish officials with whom we had initially consulted decided that the matter was of such import that it should be brought to the attention of the top officials of the government.

When we realized that the Spanish were not going to be able to discuss the matter and get back to us in time to meet our self-imposed deadline, we made alternative arrangements through Portugal. Nevertheless, the Government of Spain did advise us before the planes left the U.S. that the Spanish Government had no objection to the planes landing in Spain.

As you may know, several of the F-15's did stop over in Spain during the return flight. In fact, two of the aircraft, which had experienced mechanical trouble, landed in Spain en route to Saudi Arabia.

Following are answers to your specific questions:

It was reasonable to expect, on the basis of our treaty with Spain, that the F-15's would be allowed to land. The Treaty states that Spain grants the United States the right to use the base facilities by way of contribution to the Western defense effort.

The 1976 Treaty does provide for the use of certain air and naval bases by aircraft in transit through Spain enroute to other destinations. It has been our standing practice to consult with the Spanish Government on other than routine missions.

We first consulted with the Spanish Government on the proposed F-15 flights on January 9. Spanish officials told us that same day that they did not foresee any difficulties. However, following the press reports of the planned deployment, the Spanish officials said they wanted to have it considered by higher officials. On the morning of January 12, Defense Minister General Gutierrez-Melado informed Ambassador Todman that Prime Minister Suarez voiced no objection to the stop over of the F-15s. Although these aircraft were not scheduled to leave the United States until the 13th, we had already decided to send the planes through Portugal in order to permit orderly planning.

When we consulted with the Spanish Government on the 9th we informed it that the deployment of the F-15's would be a demonstration of US political support for Saudi Arabia and United States interest in the Middle East. We also stated that the deployment was for training and demonstration purposes for the Saudi Air Force.

We do not believe that the Spanish action was a violation of the spirit or letter of agreements or understandings with the Spanish Government.

It is possible that the considerable press coverage of the deployment, both in the US and in Spain, caused the Spanish Government to consider the matter at the highest level, thus occasioning the delay that caused us, for operational reasons, to decide on an alternative routing.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS J. BENNET, JR.,
Assistant Secretary for
Congressional Relations.

CIVIL DEFENSE—WHY NOT FOR AMERICANS?

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

• Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I recently accompanied our distinguished colleague from Georgia, LARRY McDONALD, and other members of the Armed Services Committee on a tour to inspect civil defense measures in several countries of Western Europe and the Middle East. By comparison to the United States, nearly all the countries visited are making serious commitments to the protection and survival of their civilian population in the event of a war. The Soviet Union is engaged in massive civil defense programs and also is "hardening" its factories and plants which produce military equipment. This is clearly an important factor when considering whether the Soviet Union might risk a first strike against the United States. As John Crown correctly has pointed out in the Atlanta Journal and Constitution:

It may not be the magnitude and number of missiles which determine the winner of a nuclear holocaust. It may be who can survive. And right now that is not the United States.

Mr. Crown appears to be one of the few commentators in America who has a real

grasp of the serious implications of our lack of a civil defense program against nuclear attack, and I recommend that the Members of this Congress give heed to his views.

[From the Atlanta Journal and Constitution, Feb. 3, 1979]

REPRESENTATIVE LARRY McDONALD AND OUR
CIVIL DEFENSE
(By John Crown)

In any comparison of the relative strengths of the United States and the Soviet Union it is essential that the factor of civil defense be considered.

It is rational that if one nation has the means of protecting a major segment of its population and its industrial base against nuclear attack and that nation's adversary does not have such protection a nuclear holocaust is all too possible.

The United States has made no effort to institute civil defense procedures against nuclear attack. Ergo, we look upon a nuclear holocaust as "unthinkable."

The Soviet Union has made a massive effort to protect its people and its industries against nuclear attack. Ergo, the Soviets never use the expression "unthinkable" when contemplating nuclear war.

This was brought to the fore recently by Representative Larry McDonald of Georgia's 7th Congressional District. Representative McDonald led a delegation from the House Armed Services Committee to take a look at civil defense measures in Europe and the Middle East. What he and his colleagues found emphasizes how apathetic and fatalistic we in the United States appear to be.

In Egypt, Rep. McDonald noted, the bulk of the population lives along either the Nile or the Suez Canal. What civil defense exists is a reminder of past wars. There are sandbags and bricked up windows.

Rep. McDonald and his associates found that Israel has excellent civil defense facilities for conventional wars. And a program is being prepared for coping with nuclear contingencies.

Norway is a member of the NATO alliance and is on the firing line. It has a common border with the Soviet Union. Despite limited resources—in comparison with the United States—Norway takes civil defense seriously.

"Little Norway is putting a significant effort into civil defense," Rep. McDonald told me. "It is using its subway system and is equipping it for adequate shelter. Double steel doors are installed at entrances. The subway system has independent air filters, an independent electrical supply and an independent water purification source. All new homes and new factories must include shelters for the occupants."

But it was Switzerland which really generated amazement and respect. We get the whine from Washington that our partial oil imports weaken the value of the dollar. Well, get this from Larry McDonald.

"Switzerland would really give the United States an inferiority complex," Rep. McDonald commented. "Switzerland has to import every drop of oil, every piece of coal, every ounce of uranium. Yet it has the strongest currency in the world. And from a percentage view it has the best armed forces in the world."

"All Swiss men keep their guns and their ammunition at home. Yet Switzerland has a virtually zero crime rate and a virtually zero homicide rate. And there's a message in that for all those people over here who say ownership of firearms causes crime."

"Eighty percent of all Swiss men are in the military. Ten percent have a disability which limits them to ancillary duties. The remaining 10 percent simply cannot serve and so they pay a special tax in lieu of mili-

tary duty. The Swiss can mobilize 600,000 men in 48 hours and effect total mobilization in 72 hours.

"All military aircraft are kept in underground hangars in the mountains and there are facilities for full service, even in the event of nuclear war. All new buildings must contain fallout shelters. Every home must keep on hand at least one week's supply of food. The nation maintains a one-year supply of grain. And there are available ammunition depots both above and below ground.

"Swiss Defense Minister Gnagi told us that the only way for a country to be neutral is to be able to back up that neutrality through strength. And the Swiss are doing it."

Understandably, Rep. McDonald and his group did not visit the Soviet Union in connection with civil defense study. But he points to tests which have been made in the United States utilizing Soviet civil defense manuals.

"The Soviet Union is working very thoroughly on civil defense despite Les Aspin (an ultraliberal Democratic congressman) and the CIA trying to tell us that the Soviets have no workable plan," Rep. McDonald said.

He noted that if the Lockheed plant here were to be subjected to Soviet attack it would be transformed "into confetti." But on the West Coast tests have been made following procedures in Soviet civil defense manuals.

"From those tests it has been shown that Soviet plants attacked by us would be back in operation in two weeks," Rep. McDonald remarked.

It may not be the magnitude and number of missiles which determine the winner of a nuclear holocaust. It may be who can survive. And right now that is not the United States. ●

COURT WOULD HAVE JURISDICTION OVER LABOR DISPUTES IF ESTABLISHED

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, I introduced, once again, my bill to establish a U.S. Court of Labor Management Relations that would have jurisdiction over major labor disputes that have a substantial impact on the Nation's economy.

This measure is designed to establish a mechanism for the orderly, rational and equitable resolution of labor disputes where the general public has a significant interest in the outcome.

It is designed to fill a very serious gap that now exists in our ability to deal with prolonged labor disputes, such as last year's coal strike, in a rational manner that takes into account the needs and equities of both labor and management, as well as the impact of a settlement on the consuming public.

We can no longer afford settlements wherein management "caves in" to labor simply to avoid a strike, and passes on the cost to the public in the form of higher prices. Nor can we afford prolonged strikes, that leave plant and equipment idled, and consumers deprived of important goods and services.

The court described in this bill achieves a middle ground between

strikes or lockouts, which I consider a form of economic barbarism, and compulsory arbitration, which I believe is too susceptible to charges of capriciousness.

In our Nation, we submit virtually every type of dispute to a court of law for its resolution. So far, we have seemed unwilling to do the same for labor disputes, I fail to understand this, especially in light of recent talk favoring the submission of disputes involving public employees to arbitration. I believe the time has come to give serious attention to this proposal, and I commend it to my colleagues for their consideration. ●

PHILIP M. CRANE

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, one of our most eloquent, hardest working, and brightest colleagues was recently written about in Private Practice magazine.

Since that colleague, the Honorable PHILIP CRANE, may soon be moving to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, I would like to bring this article to the attention of the entire House by inserting it in the RECORD:

PHIL CRANE AND THE PRESIDENCY

(By Michael Watterlond)

In the doldrums of last summer, the bad planning and chaos of this almost tropical capital of Washington, D.C., were even more befuddling than usual. Shining slabs of marble loomed surprisingly over a steaming jungle of urban trees and beneath the trees there was the boggling pattern of streets and avenues that inexplicably meandered and bent and lost themselves without logic or reason. Nothing seems simply to go from here to there in this city.

And in this mishmash of tangled pavement it often seems as though every misconceived notion in the country has settled here and taken root in institutionalization. But unfortunately this is a country still young enough to have energetic and ambitious men and women who welcome the chance to weed these notions out.

Even though it is a frustrating and seemingly fruitless job, Congressman Philip Crane of Illinois, chairman of the American Conservative Union and member of the House subcommittee on health, thinks he is the man to do it. Phil Crane wants to be President.

Last summer he made the national announcement that he will seek election to the office of the President. He has been shown on network television kissing his wife, his children, sharing great hopes with the admiring staff of his office. And the media generally concede that even in these early months he has as good a chance to win the Presidency as Governor Carter did when he announced in December 1974.

And now, on these hectic election-year mornings, there are members of the press who perhaps could not have identified Phil Crane only a few months ago, but who now jot down and record his statements on NHI, taxation, campaigns, the future, the direction of conservative philosophy. It is clear to the writers and photographers that they have something special on their hands—a handsome, articulate, intellectual conservative with presidential aspirations who will

look you in the eye and smile when he says "revolution!"

Possibly what he means is "rebellion," but nevertheless, Philip Crane has found a national bandwagon, a national movement, and an awaiting audience in these days when taxpayers have stopped shaking their heads in amazement and have started picking up pitchforks, tar pails, and initiative petitions.

Crane's square-jawed, conservative stand on national medical issues has given him a firm basis of argument as regards what the press is calling our "tax revolt."

Crane has made repeated attacks on the faults of the national government in the medical field. He is a great enthusiast of free enterprise and imagination as well as hard work and determination—all things he prettily much dismisses from federal programs.

"Those who advance the idea of crisis in American medical care argue that government intervention is necessary because we have a shortage of doctors," Crane says. "Somehow, they say, government control of medicine will ease this shortage. Unfortunately, most of the participants in this debate accept as a given notion that a doctor shortage exists."

"Since 1965 the number of doctors has increased at a rate three times that of the population, yet much of the discussion about the alleged shortage of doctors has proceeded as if there has been no change in the situation."

Crane has been a champion of privacy in medical records. And a vociferous foe of National Health Insurance.

"The potential for abuse cannot be overlooked," he says of governmental access to medical records. "Unless a greater degree of confidentiality is extended to private medical records, an Ellsberg break-in would no longer be necessary if a government official wanted to examine sensitive psychiatric records for unauthorized reasons. The records would be already available."

He has introduced legislation to limit, in fact prohibit, government access to medical records of any treatment not paid for through federal funds. His position is that such a bill would prove a great relief to patients not receiving federal assistance and would, at the same time, provide some point of consideration for evaluation of federal medical aid through veterans' benefits, Social Security, or Medicare assistance. HEW has lobbied against his bill.

On the subject of National Health Insurance, Crane makes no bones about his opposition:

"There is every reason for Americans to reject the idea of National Health Insurance. If we carefully consider the strengths of our private practice system and the availability of private health insurance tailored to each person's needs and resources, and compare it to the weaknesses of the socialized medical systems of other countries, and then review the failure of our own government programs such as Medicare and Medicaid, that conclusion becomes inevitable. 'Let us not in the name of 'better health care' set in motion a series of events that will damage medical care, impose heavy new taxes, and demolish more individual liberty.'"

Crane's position on these medical issues sets him in line with much of the public hue and cry these days about taxes and tax use in general.

Although the Congressman's marketability as a presidential candidate has been touted by Crane enthusiasts from the start (he took the congressional seat Donald Rumsfeld left to join the Nixon Administration in 1969), it cannot be denied that today's voter concern for headline conservative tax attitudes has made him even more attractive than ever.

"I would not want to be running for anything in this country," Crane says, "on a platform that does not support serious tax reform."

"The point I would like to make is that I, first of all, embrace any and all initiatives designed to get a handle on taxes. I think the protest in California was dramatic, but it was a symptom of more than protest over the levels of real estate taxes. It was a commentary, in fact, on the increasing perception by the public that the government is taking too much of our money and not spending it intelligently.

"I think, in that protest, lies great hope." Crane has one of the great gifts all politicians ache for, but which so few of them actually possess: he can talk. And think while he is doing it.

In a town where second- and third-term Congressmen have to go through 20 takes for a 30-second television campaign spot, the image of this natural speaker and thinker is a freshening sight. He is a good old-time orator when he wants to be. It is easy to picture him up on the stump denouncing or supporting just about anything credibly—and his gift for speaking is sharply enhanced by that fact when he talks, he may say what you expect him to say, but even if he does, it sounds fresh and original and sincere and not at all like party cant.

After a few minutes in the presence of Philip Crane, it is easy to see that the next couple years of campaigning are going to give the country something to think about.

Already Crane has become a lively topic of conversation among the veteran pundits and observers of Washington's political landscape. In the midst of a conversation about taxes in general, the television roundtable group of Martin Agronsky's guests nearly jump out of their seats when someone mentions that in the summer of 1978 a not-too-well-known Congressman from Illinois has announced his candidacy for a presidential election years away.

Conservative columnist Jack Kilpatrick offers an initial assessment of the situation: "Here's a fellow," Kilpatrick muses, "who wants to be President. He can talk well. He thinks rather well—in his world. You may not agree with it . . ."

"There are a lot of people," chimes in columnist Carl Rowan with a professional air, "who think Proposition 13, this capital gains business, and so forth, all mean that the country is drifting toward a greater conservatism." Rowan, whose political ideas are about as far from those of Jack Kilpatrick as one can find on this planet, says this as though it were still news.

"Crane apparently believes this and thinks people have moved far enough that he can be elected," Rowan says.

"And that possibility," Kilpatrick retorts, "would just break your heart, wouldn't it?"

"Yes!" Rowan affirms. "It would break my heart if Philip Crane were elected."

There is much subsequent shouting and Agronsky steers the conversation off toward questions of morality and unwed test tube mothers.

So the battle has begun.

Crane comes from hearty American roots. His grandfather worked a steel mill in Kentucky and with the upward aspirations of American parents, managed to send the Congressman's father to medical school. And Dr. George Crane, the syndicated columnist-medical adviser, has done well by his own sons: a PhD history professor (Philip); a dentist (Daniel); and a psychiatrist with a law degree (David). And this year all three sons ran for congress; Philip at 47 sought reelection; Daniel, 42, ran for Congress also from Illinois, and David, 40, campaigned in Indiana. Philip got over 80% of the vote; Daniel won too, but David lost a close race.

With two brothers in Congress, there will undoubtedly develop a "Crane Compound" like the "Kennedy Compound." Philip and his wife Arlene live in the stylish and quiet suburb of McLean, Virginia with their eight children—a clan in themselves.

All Crane brothers pretty much express the same conservative concerns. Philip's is perhaps seen most particularly in his dealing with medical issues on the health subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee.

For instance, in an interview with *Private Practice* one morning at the National Press Club in Washington, Congressman Crane assesses the effects of government regulation on medical practice and research.

"I think it has a negative and stifling effect on the provision of quality medical care," he says. "I think we can provide abundant evidence of this. Whether it is in the area of development of new drugs or in the area of attempting to allocate the purchase of new, expensive, and absolutely necessary medical equipment and additional hospital beds.

"It is my hope that we might focus attention on how well government is providing quality medical care at a proper cost.

"You can hold down—at least as a percentage of the gross national product—the medical care costs of a nation by government intrusion into the field, but you do so at a considerable cost in terms of the quality of service that is provided the citizens and in the availability of that service.

"I think one should have greater faith in the ability of the marketplace and consumer democracy to allocate scarce resources than in politicians with a limited understanding of the nature of the problem, much less in bureaucrats who may have their own self-interest, not necessarily in promoting quality medical care, but in guaranteeing that they shall continue to enjoy their jobs and their perks and their opportunity to exercise and wield increasing power over our lives."

Speaking of power, how does it feel to be a minority party Congressman without the backup power of a Republican presidential veto?

"It is a frustrating role, but one filled with plenty of opportunity to make political hay," he smiles. "Frustrating in that none of the constructive initiatives introduced by Republicans are inclined to go anywhere. They get referred to committee and languish there eternally. The exception is when, through the amendment process, we can force the majority into a situation where they have to go on record. And occasionally we have our own God-and-Motherhood-and-Apple-Pie proposals that they can't very well vote against—particularly in an election year!

"But political opportunities are greater than when you have a Republican in the White House and a massive Democratic majority control in Congress.

"The reason for that is that Republican Presidents in that situation tend to make compromises to accommodate the majority.

"I remember once when then minority leader Jerry Ford returned from a White House briefing on the Family Assistance Plan, which was presented as a Republican welfare reform program. You may recall that this included the guaranteed income provision.

"I explained to Jerry Ford at the time that that was not a Republican position, it was Nixon's position," Crane laughs. "And one must make the distinction and keep it clear."

One easily gets the impression Philip Crane is the sort of man who makes distinctions and keeps them clear. He has the drive and willingness to take conservative positions into the union halls, the farm co-ops, anywhere people will listen to his straightforward interpretations of the country's historic paths into what he sees as a tangled mass of social and commercial over-regulation and government intrusion.

He is the sort of man who would not have designed the knotted mess of streets and avenues that steamed in the Washington

summer. He would have laid it out as simply and straightforwardly as any sensible mid-western city. It would be someplace where it would not be impossible to go simply from here to there. ●

ASHBROOK TAKES A LOOK AT TENG HSIAO-PING

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, Human Events of February 10, 1979, reported some very succinct comments by our colleague JOHN ASHBROOK, of Ohio, relative to Mr. Teng and just who he is. As Congressman ASHBROOK described it Teng's whole background has been one of violence against his own people and subversion of his neighbors. And for those who doubt that Communist China will use force to liberate Taiwan, they have only to look at today's newspapers and the fighting going on in Vietnam. I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues:

ASHBROOK TAKES A LOOK AT TENG HSIAO-PING

Rep. John Ashbrook (R.-Ohio), a member of the House Select Committee on Intelligence, launched a full-scale attack against Teng Hsiao-Ping last week, insisting he was active in a number of Maoist campaigns that produced "millions of murders."

During one of the worst of these campaigns, said the Ohioan, Teng played an open public role. This was the "political liquidation" of 1949 to 1958, when some 15 million to 30 million Chinese were killed by Mao's actions. Teng, says Ashbrook, "was an active participant in the slaughter" in his various posts: First Secretary of the South West Bureau of the Communist party, Political Commissar of the South West Military Area, Vice Premier of Red China, Secretary General of the Central Committee of the Communist party, and member of the Politburo.

Ashbrook accused Teng of playing a major role in 1957 in trapping millions of Chinese, and leading them to their deaths. After eight years of "mass murder, Mao advanced the slogan, 'let a hundred flowers blossom, . . . let a hundred schools of thought contend.'" The Chinese people, noted the Ohioan, "took this policy to mean an end to persecution, slave labor camps and executions. They spoke out against the horrors that they had suffered since 1949. But the liberalization was temporary. It was meant to trap the dissidents.

"After some months of free speech and active participation in the political process by the Chinese people, the Communist leaders struck. The arrests and killings resumed. The man chosen by Mao Tse-tung to resume the oppression was Teng-Hsiao-Ping, the man who is being welcomed by our country."

In a speech made to the Central Committee of the Communist party, Teng, the secretary general, announced the new wave of purges, stating: "The spread of Marxism-Leninism and political education must be strengthened, erroneous thinking must be criticized, and poisonous weeds must be rooted out. By permitting the emergence of 'poisonous weeds' we intend to educate the masses through negative examples, to uproot the 'weeds' and use them as fertilizer and to steel the proletariat and the masses in struggle."

According to an expert observer of the Chinese Communist scene, Richard L. G. Deverall, who represented the American

Federation of Labor in Asia for many years, Teng was involved in the illegal narcotics traffic of the Red Chinese regime as well.

While our country welcomes Teng, said Ashbrook, his government organizes insurgency and terrorism against America's friend Thailand. The CIA estimates that there are 9,400 Communist insurgents engaged in military operations against that country. The Red Chinese "maintain the radio facilities for the insurgents and terrorists, called the 'Voice of the People of Thailand.' The Nov. 17, 1978, issue of the Far Eastern Economic Review, one of the most respected publications dealing with Far Eastern matters, pointed out that Teng had publicly refused last year to renounce support for the insurgency group before he visited Thailand. Sources close to Teng's entourage informed the Review, moreover, that the most important leaders of the Maoist insurgency lived in exile in China. Said Ashbrook:

"The political arm of the Thai Communists is called the Committee for Coordinating Patriotic and Democratic Forces (CCPDF). This front was set up in September 1977. It issues a bulletin in the English language every few months. The bulletin called CCPDF News Service is mailed from Laos.

"The Thai insurgents and terrorists received greetings from pro-Red Chinese groups all over the world on the first anniversary of the CCPDF in September 1978. Among the greetings were some from groups in the United States, including the Communist party (Marxist-Leninist, a group) controlled by Red China which is actively participating in the welcome to Teng."

TENG: UNITED STATES-CHINA PACT WILL SPUR TAIWAN LIBERATION

Teng Hsiao-Ping may be the rage in the United States at the moment, but what his true feelings are toward the U.S.—what he really believes about rapprochement with America—may have been reflected in the speech he gave in Peking July 20, 1977, during the Third Plenum of the 10th Central Committee on the Chinese Party.

The notes, taken by one present at the meeting, were published in May 1978 by the Chinese [Taiwan] Information Service in New York and obviously come from Nationalist Chinese intelligence sources, which are considered quite accurate.

Responding to criticism concerning Red China's growing relations with the United States, Teng stressed that many charge that "we have abandoned the basic stand of international class struggle, and aligned ourselves with the true No. 1 enemy of socialism, namely, U.S. imperialism. . . ."

Being Marxists, Teng countered, "we would never be so stupid as to be incapable of distinguishing friend from foe. Whether it is Nixon, Ford, Carter or any future leader of U.S. imperialism, none of them can climb out of the same merry-go-round. Their purpose is to exploit the split between the Chinese and Soviet Communist parties to bring about the downfall of world socialism as well as to checkmate the Soviet threat to them."

But Teng goes on to say that Red China should instead exploit the United States—not only to counter Soviet "hegemonism" but to obtain Taiwan. "Improvement of China-U.S. relations is an inevitable trend," said Teng. "With the development of this trend, U.S. imperialism would accede to our demands. The normalization of China-U.S. diplomatic relations will naturally be conducive to the resolution of the Taiwan issue."

At present, added Teng, the United States has "something to ask from us, and we hold the complete initiative in dealing with them. From the standpoint of political significance and economic development, we must firmly grasp the existing situation that is favorable

to us, and accelerate the implementation of our current foreign policy. This is completely in keeping with the basic interests of our people.

"On the political, economic and diplomatic fronts, we should assume an aggressive posture at all times. But militarily our posture should be defensive. We must defend our national sovereignty and territorial integrity. Taiwan must be liberated, it being only a question of time." Solution of the Taiwan matter is not a simple matter, Teng added, but "eventually it will have to be done through military action." ●

EVALUATION REGARDING HEW GRANTS

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I hereby submit for the RECORD evaluations regarding HEW activity in my district. This is to support action taken to secure answers and necessary corrective steps through HEW, GAO, and other appropriate authorities. The letters follow:

JANUARY 19, 1979.

DEAR MR. HANSEN: Thank you for letting me review the documents about SIFMES. What is the meaning of the term "patient encounters"? What happens to the dollars generated from patient visits? A substantial federal grant, plus fees from patients, makes health care costly. Would it not be better in future policy decisions to have such grants given as loans to initiate practice rather than as outright grants to compete in communities?

Something that has puzzled me is why were the two grants awarded in which the Medical Society input was ignored? If two grants were reviewed in normal process by the Medical Society, why were not all grants involving federal dollars reviewed by the Medical Society? In view of the comments made by the Medical Society, why did not the granting agency request modification of the plan for expenditures or, at least, investigate community need?

Sincerely yours,

JANUARY 23, 1979.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HANSEN: We have received your letter dated 1-9-79 along with documents concerning the financial and organizational structure of SIFMES, and appreciate your concern in this matter. We apologize for the delay in answering your inquiry but felt there were several points which required some careful scrutiny and these were somewhat time consuming. It is always difficult to criticize the way other people run their business and spend "their" money, (probably more to the point is how they acquired such large sums of federal monies to finance their ventures in the first place) but at any rate we have given careful consideration to the documents which you entrusted to us and feel there are at least a few items which we should comment on. We have attempted to do this in an objective manner since any criticism or input we have attempted in the past has immediately been seized upon by the SIFMES group as pure emotionalism and an attempt by us to protect our "home turf" against intrusion by outside medical care. Isn't it ironic that at this time the mere presence of federally funded physicians in our community prevents us from recruiting quality physicians

to join us in delivering health care to our area. It would seem that indeed the physician shortage is rapidly becoming a thing of the past. In fact, we have had at least six inquiries from soon-to-be family physicians who are interested in a rural practice such as ours, but due to the present physician supply in our area and the subsequent unlikely opportunity for a rapidly growing practice they have been discouraged from settling in this area.

The first and most obvious inconsistency in the SIFMES program is their statement that federal subsidies will be required for three years to establish the Soda Springs project in order to become a self sufficient enterprise. If, in fact, this area is so desperately medically deprived and underserved, why would this venture require three years to develop a patient population that would support their clinic financially? Would it not stand to reason that in such an underserved area as they describe ours to be, patients would literally be beating down the door in order to acquire "quality" medical care which according to the SIFMES has not been available to them in the past? Possibly there may be an alternative explanation as to why it requires such a long time to become self supporting. Could it be that it is much simpler to let federal funds finance a business venture to help pay for modern, well equipped medical facilities while establishing a patient population rather than investing one's own energies and finances as the rest of us practicing in the community have done? We feel this is a valid point for consideration. It is further interesting to note in this regard some interesting statistics. One of the selling points SIFMES used most strongly prior to their coming to Soda Springs was the large number of patients leaving the county to seek medical care. In particular and most often mentioned was the number of women going out of the county to deliver babies. The arrival of SIFMES on the scene, therefore, was to result in a large increase in the number of births in our local hospital. Unfortunately this has not proved to be the case. In 1976 (the last full calendar year before SIFMES was in the community) the number of births in Caribou Memorial Hospital was 163. Last year, 1978, the number was 118. Not exactly an overwhelming increase. Checking further with our hospital statistics show that in the year and a half SIFMES has been here the average daily census in the hospital has not changed either. Where are all these medically underserved people?

Another point we are continually hearing is that we must have continuing increase in the number of doctors in order to be able to cope with the boom growth of our area secondary to new industrial development. The simple fact is that Soda Springs is not now and will not be in the foreseeable future, a boom town. Soda Springs census figures further point this out:

	People
1960	2,424
1967	3,456
1970	2,938
1974	3,487

A further demonstration of this stabilized rate of growth in the area is the school enrollment over the past several years. The following figures are for School District #150 (Soda Springs) and represent total enrollment grades 1-12:

	Students
1970	1,250
1974	1,162
1978	1,048

We think these figures certainly demonstrate that we are not faced with an overwhelming increase in population and in fact we may be seeing just the opposite. We believe the

economy in our area is stable but certainly is not booming. The present economic status of our country as a whole and also the current battle between the mining industry and the environmentalists both speak against any rapid industrial and population growth in our area.

As we further review the information you sent us concerning the financial report of SIFMES, one glaring inflationary figure is obvious. We refer to the page of the report labeled Exhibit B (page one) which lists the salary allowance for 1 1/4 FTE physician as \$72,691.67. This seems extraordinarily high in itself, but it is not this figure which we question (presumably SIFMES can pay their employees whatever they wish). The figure we wish to question severely is the "In residence call @ \$200/15 hrs". What this means is that after office hours they are allowing \$13/hr. to a physician to take call for their group. According to the emergency room records of Caribou Memorial Hospital, doctors from SIFMES took care of 385 patients January 1, 1978 to December 31, 1978 in the emergency room. Simple arithmetic figures this to be a cost of \$167.48 per patient seen. This is a staggering amount and we think a totally unacceptable spending of tax payers dollars. Surely 385 patients per year, which is just more than one per day, could be handled between the five physicians already in the area exclusive of those employed by SIFMES.

One further figure we would challenge is the malpractice amount of \$7,026.58 for 1 1/4 physicians coverage in Soda Springs. This is exceptionally high considering the type of practice the SIFMES physicians are involved in and also the fact that our malpractice is just over \$2,000.00/year each.

We appreciate your interest in this gross misuse of tax payers' dollars. Please be advised that we certainly do not ask for any favors. All we ask for now and all we have ever asked for is *fair play*. In a setting such as ours, it is entirely inappropriate to expect private physicians (who must be self-sustaining from the day that they enter practice rather than living off ill-advised federal grants and tax payers dollars for a period of three years to achieve financial independence) to compete with federally subsidized medicine. Please be further advised that this in no way represents a personal attack on the physicians themselves who are involved with SIFMES. We have no personal quarrel with them and do not in any way accuse them of delivering less than adequate care to the patients they have cared for. The question is a very basic one. That is, in our American system of free enterprise is it appropriate for federally subsidized programs to compete under these circumstances with those who are engaged in the same business but who are not subsidized and must bear their own expenses in order to stay in business and make a living. We do not feel it is fair; we feel it is totally inappropriate to supply SIFMES with continuing federal grant monies to support their private enterprise and we feel that after consideration of this problem you will feel the same way.

Sincerely,

JANUARY 24, 1979.

DEAR MR. HANSEN: Enclosed are comments on the additional data which was forwarded to me regarding the HEW grants in Pocatello during the past year. This letter will assume the posture of comments on the progress reports of 1978, the first being 4/25/78. There is a statement that the Board has provided a forum for planning—this is true but the forum has not been a total community planning. It has been a forum for SIFMES and the Family Medical Center. The report also states that the changes were in Montpelier due to institutional maturity and flexibility of designing organizational responses. It is

my understanding that in reality the changes in Montpelier were more due to hard core political and medical pressures because of displeasure of the concept of SIFMES and the Family Practice Group. At the bottom of page 32 there is a statement that the Consortium Board has shown itself to be an invaluable institution in development, coordination, promotion and administration of health care in Eastern Idaho. This is the Board's opinion of itself. I am sure that if the HEW were to survey Eastern Idaho's health professionals they would find a much different attitude regarding this.

Page 33 is also very misleading, inasmuch as it says that there has been mutual planning between a wide variety of health providers and listed is hospital administrators, hospital board members, pharmacists, physicians, paramedics, health and welfare administrators, district health service providers and many others. This statement is inaccurate. There has not been a wide variety of exchange of information in mutual planning and there has not been a willingness to come together to plan, to share and to cooperate as stated in this paragraph. Again this is a statement by SIFMES and if a survey were taken of the individuals and type of institutions listed you would find that there has been very little support to the concept of SIFMES.

On page 34 in discussing Lava Hot Springs there is a statement that Dr. Katz has served the clinic well and there is anticipation that he will continue the role in the foreseeable future. Dr. Katz has discontinued his services with the Family Practice Clinic as have many other physicians who have served one year or less. HEW could find this information out very rapidly by having an onsite inspection to the total community and not just an onsite inspection limited to the Family Practice Group. It is a gross overstatement that the Lava clinical operation must be termed a significant success. This certainly could be challenged. It states that Lava Hot Springs is clearly on the way for financial self-sufficiency by year three. This also could be severely challenged. The addition of a half-time physicians assistant and the basis of the population of the number of individuals that can be served in this area is obviously budgetary overloading.

The Lava HURRHI Clinic is an example of just about everything going right as stated on page 36. This again is a statement of impression of the SIFMES and should not be accepted on face value.

The discussion of the Soda Springs Group must be considered and the basis of the fact that there has been much opposition to the Soda Springs facility in this area although the records do show acceptance by the political authorities but absence of acceptance by the health professionals. A statement is made that the negotiations under way for purchase of a piece of land. Again, is this to be done through public funds as all the rest of the organizations or is this to be done through private funds as the remainder of the health organizations in Eastern Idaho. There is a discussion of the isolation of Soda Springs. Soda Springs has had 24 hour physician coverage for many years and if the concept of SIFMES were less oriented to a closed group practice the additional budget for 24 hour physician coverage would not be necessary. The promises of the proposal preparation period appeared to melt away in the reality of actual project as stated and this is very true, reflecting the resistance and the lack of acceptance in Soda Springs of the concept of publicly funded medical care.

There is also a comment that the District Health Service and the State Department of Health and Welfare represented on the Consortium Board have provided marvelous cooperation in establishment of the Soda Springs facility. This may be true although

the responsibility of the District Health Service and the State Department of Health and Welfare has never been one to establish tax funded programs in competition or in lieu of private practice when the latter has demonstrated its ability to provide excellent care at a much more economical figure. The Soda Springs SIFMES program entered Soda Springs at a time and in such a way that it disallowed Soda Springs obtaining additional private practitioners who would live in Soda Springs.

It is doubtful if the failure of the Montpelier SIFMES proposal can be attributed as a success to SIFMES when in reality it is a success to the ability of a community to handle its needs itself. The Downey operation is marginal. This has been an area which has been handled well by private enterprise at a much less cost than public money and should continue to do so if given the opportunity and if HEW does not step in through SIFMES and negate the possibility of individual operation.

On page 40 note is made that Dr. Romeo was appointed as the Physician Director for the Southeast Idaho District Health Service. Dr. Romeo should be removed from this position immediately inasmuch as judged by his reports he is obviously using this as a stepping stone to frontal State District Health Programs into the Family Practice Clinic instead of serving the entire area through present medical facilities. Dr. Romeo's statement that there has been a significant increase in joint planning, immunization monitoring and programming is in direct violation of the purpose of the Idaho District Health Service inasmuch as this is being coordinated and directed through SIFMES and the Family Practice Clinic. The Pocatello Free Clinic is staffed by physicians in Pocatello who give their time freely and without charge and also two evenings a week the Family Practice Clinic supplies two P.A.'s who are paid for their service. This is not a realistic means for a granting organization. The adolescent health care program has resulted in an absolute closed door of working relationships with area schools, the intention to provide a by-product of recruitment for the Family Practice Group, clinical facilities and patients may or may not have been met. The grant should never have been given inasmuch as the Family Practice Group and SIFMES does not have the type of personnel to handle such a grant. In addition, such a grant is unnecessary and is a fault of the position of grantsmanship applying for types of money that are available rather than applying for needs of this area. The same thing applies to the mental health liaison program with the Southeast Idaho Medical Center. This is obviously an effort to withdraw psychiatric programs from the private psychiatric group in Eastern Idaho and channel it through SIFMES which has less capable psychiatric clinical capabilities—having no psychiatrists on their staff.

There is also a statement that there are plans for expanded dental service in cooperation with the local dentist in Downey. This again falls into the realm of funneling overhead into SIFMES and therefore increasing cost of dental care significantly. The report further states that during the next year particular care is being taken to increase services to adolescents, mental health services, immunization levels of all program participants. First, these efforts are redundant inasmuch as these areas are being handled in this area and before such statements should be accepted a basic evaluation should be made at least by interviewing the health professionals in the area rather than by accepting as fact statement by an organization who's very philosophy of life is to apply and obtain as many grants as possible.

Initial contact has been made with the

State Crippled Childrens Agency for linkage grant by the end of the second program year. This is a State Grant which is functioning well at the present time and the superimposition of linkage money is unnecessary. Not only unnecessary and costly but the SIFMES and Family Practice Group are in no way equipped nor do they have personnel on board to handle this type of program. At the present time this is being handled very effectively through other individuals and the State of Idaho and this is obviously a power bid with federal money to build a private program.

The last statement on page 43 is that their history of cooperation with others is very difficult to support. On Appendix C first quarter report, 1978, another linkage grant is mentioned between Ambulatory Health Care Facilities and Community Health Centers. Once again SIFMES and the Family Practice Group is not the organization in Eastern Idaho to accomplish this—if indeed such is necessary. It would be informative to find out who are the oncology and pediatric specialists who go to see the rural physicians. To the best of my knowledge I'm unaware of public medical education and service programs being implemented through the CETA aids. On the contrary there is a reasonably effective educational program in Eastern Idaho at this time primarily for professionals which is completely independent of SIFMES.

Additional comment is made of the continuing coordination with the Southeastern Idaho Health Department. The above comments, I believe, are relevant. The same statements are applicable to the HURA Grants specifically for Western Caribou County, Soda Springs, and Grace which is a linkage grant proposal between Community Mental Health Centers and SIFMES service sites and a grant to provide services to adolescents. These again are an attempt to attract federal dollars in an area that is unnecessary and is already handled. The American Falls Center which is funded by Kellogg Foundation Grant is in direct competition with the University of Utah Outreach program. This is a small community and this is an instance of overkill by enthusiasts who desire to obtain federal grants regardless of their need nor community acceptance.

Discussions on Quarterly Report, November through January, 1978. On page 3, SIFMES proposal for diagnosis and care and response to adolescents health initiative states that this will be submitted in the third quarter, will outline health days in eight rural area junior and senior high schools. The type of material presented to the school boards is such that it is very unlikely that the school boards will even accept this type of proposal. It is also self-building to the Family Practice Group for private medicine that the referral services will be provided for adolescents for medical, dental, mental and social services. This again echos the general function of the total concept to use federal money to build a private clinic for profit and through SIFMES as a vehicle. The figures quoted on page 4 are those of the District Health Department in an effort to provide credence to the claim of SIFMES that the District Health Department should favor SIFMES through coordination grants. The tables regarding encounters is difficult to understand because an encounter is not identified. The validity of the figures is questioned and should be certified by actual examination and tabulation of the clinical charts. Comment is made of the uncertainty of funding for Soda Springs. This may be better paraphrased as the inadequate funding to provide federally funded competition for family practice physicians in private practice to other private practice physicians in Soda Springs who do

not have federal funding for overhead, equipment and personnel.

One other item deserves comment and that is that there is reasonable question to doubt Mr. Oberlin's background and knowledge to serve as a satisfactory individual for critique of such a professional service.

In summary, the basic problems are those of, 1) the basic concept of declaring Eastern Idaho a disaster area in public health is false; 2) the need of imposing and infusing large amounts of federal funds to maintain and improve quality of care in Eastern Idaho at the expense of the private practice and at the expense of the taxpayers pocketbook is certainly doubtful; 3) there appears to be reason to believe that the grant proposals may be very generous; 4) the reality psychiatric adolescent grant is a figment of imagination, a waste of federal money and a very obvious intent to fortify an individual clinic with federal dollars at the expense of the remaining practitioners in Eastern Idaho. It is surprising that this was granted by HEW even though the Family Practice Clinic is not well qualified in this field particularly inasmuch as there is a satisfactory cadre of psychiatrists and well-trained family practitioners outside of the Family Practice Group. The linkage grants again use federal money to favor a particularly private, for profit clinic and in doing so use state funds which historically do not need this type of linkage grants to function well and is an effort to remove from the present satisfactory method of function and certain stated health functions and channel them into the Family Practice Group. And lastly, the satellite grants have had a negative effect in many areas inasmuch as they have completely discouraged the establishment of physicians who will move into an area and live there at no expense to the taxpayer.

The entire operation is a federally funded program which is based upon fallacious input and by which a private profit group, the Family Practice Clinic, is being established.

Very truly yours,

P.S. The two rented 4 wheel drives are seen in Pocatello all the time. And they apparently are rented for the Soda Springs Highway. 2. A SIFMES member has a private airplane which may be related to budget figures for a private plane.

JANUARY 26, 1979.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HANSEN: You probably are not aware of the rural health initiative grant made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Idaho Migrant Council. In a nut shell, they proposed and made application for a grant to serve the migrant and seasonal farm workers in the Blackfoot area. At the initial grant hearing, approximately six months ago, there were many persons present which offered evidence to refute their claims of need. The grant at that time was turned down on this basis. I note, however, that the grant must have been reworded and what appears to be arbitrarily approved by the bureaucracy in the Seattle area. This approval was done without another public hearing.

I do not believe there is factual evidence to support that there are 2,000 to 3,000 migrant and seasonal farm workers who are medically underserved in Bingham County. I also do not feel that the death rate in Bingham County for newborn infants is any higher than other areas of our state, as they contended.

It is my understanding that the total grant amounted to nearly one-half million dollars, which somehow is to be divided between the Blackfoot area and a grant in Twin Falls. I submit that this is a gross waste of taxpayer money! I would also submit that many of the migrant farm workers in this area (in fact the vast majority) are illegal aliens.

I realize there may be nothing that you can do about this, but if there is, your attention would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

P.S.—I might add that my voice is not an isolated voice, but represents the view of all the physicians, the administration of Bingham Memorial Hospital in Blackfoot, and the Southeastern District Health Department, which serves our county. ●

THE REGULATORY REFORM ACT OF 1979 INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Regulatory Reform Act of 1979 with a bipartisan group of 36 cosponsors. An identical bill was introduced in the Senate last week by Senators CHARLES PERCY and ROBERT C. BYRD. Congresswoman Barbara Jordan and I first introduced this bill as H.R. 3100 back on February 3, 1977. An identical measure, S. 600, was introduced in the Senate on the same day by Senators PERCY, BYRD, and RIBICOFF. This is nearly identical to legislation introduced in the 94th Congress by Senators PERCY, BYRD, and RIBICOFF, and Ms. Jordan and myself and 62 House cosponsors. Some revisions in the bill have been made as a result of hearings held in the last Congress.

My bill is aimed at reorganizing Federal regulatory agencies to prevent excessive, duplicative, inflationary, and anticompetitive regulation and to make regulation more effective and responsive to the public interest. It would do this by establishing an 8-year timetable for Presidential submission of and congressional action on four comprehensive regulatory reform plans in each of the next four Congresses. Under the terms of the bill, the President would submit the required plan by May 1 of the first session, and Congress would have to act on that plan or a revised version by May 1 of the second session. If Congress has not enacted a plan by August 1 of the second session, the affected agencies would lose authority to promulgate new rules and regulations; if Congress has not enacted a plan by October 1, the affected agencies would lose their authority to enforce existing rules and regulations; and, if Congress has not enacted a plan by the end of December, the affected agencies would be terminated ("sunset"). The following areas would be covered in each Congress: First, energy, environment, housing, and occupational health and safety, 97th Congress; Second, transportation and communications, 98th Congress; Third, banking and finance, international trade, and Government procurement, 99th Congress; and Fourth, food, consumer health and safety, economic trade practices, and labor-management relations, 100th Congress.

Each plan submitted by the President must contain recommendations for the transfer, consolidation, modification, or elimination of functions; organizational,

structural and procedural reforms; the merger, modification, establishment or abolition of Federal regulations or agencies; eliminating or phasing out of outdated, overlapping or conflicting regulatory jurisdictions or requirements of general applicability; eliminating agency delays; and increasing economic competition. The plans would also report on the cumulative impact of all Government regulatory activity covered by that plan on specified industry groupings.

Mr. Speaker, I think the time is long overdue for adoption of this approach given the high priority President Carter has placed on Government reorganization and the elimination of excessive and cost regulations. As recently as his state of the Union message, the President said: "We must begin to scrutinize the overall effect of regulation on our economy." With all due respect, many of us in both Houses of Congress have been scrutinizing the effects for more than 4 years. It is past the time to begin to scrutinize, it is time to enact legislation and get on with eliminating waste and reducing costs.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include a list of our cosponsors and a summary of our bill:

Pursuant to clause 4 of rule XXII of the rules of the House of Representatives, the following sponsors are hereby added to Regulatory Reform Act of 1979.

Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BENJAMIN, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DAVIS (Mich.), Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. EDWARDS (Okla.), Mr. EMERY, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JENNETTE.

Mr. LOTT, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOORE, Mr. MURPHY (Pa.), Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. BOB WILSON (Calif.), Mr. WON PAT.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE REGULATORY REFORM ACT OF 1979

(1) Not later than the last day of April in each of the years specified, the President shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive regulatory reform plan for each of the following designated areas (specific agencies affected are enumerated in the bill):

(a) 1981 (97th Congress)—energy, environment, housing and occupational health and safety;

(b) 1983 (98th Congress)—transportation and communications;

(c) 1985 (99th Congress)—banking and finance, international trade, and government procurement; and

(d) 1987 (100th Congress)—food, consumer health and safety, economic trade practices, and labor-management relations.

(2) Each plan submitted by the President shall contain recommendations for:

(a) the transfer, consolidation, modification of functions;

(b) organizational, structural and procedural reforms;

(c) the merger, modification, establishment or abolition of Federal regulations or agencies;

(d) eliminating or phasing out of outdated, overlapping or conflicting regulatory jurisdictions or requirements of general applicability;

(e) eliminating agency delays; and

(f) increasing economic competition.

(3) Each plan submitted by the President shall report on the cumulative impact of

all government regulatory activity reviewed on the following specific industry groupings:

(a) transportation and agriculture;

(b) mining, heavy manufacturing, and public utilities;

(c) construction and light manufacturing; and

(d) communications, financing, insurance, real estate, trade and service.

(4) If the President fails to submit the required plans, the appropriate committees of Congress having legislative jurisdiction in the areas covered, together with the House and Senate Government Operations Committees, shall prepare the appropriate plans which shall become the pending business of each House not later than the first day of April of the following year.

(5) The Comptroller General and the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall submit reports at the same time a plan is submitted detailing the purposes of each agency covered by the plan, any changes in the areas covered by the agency and their impact on the effectiveness of the agency, the net impact of the agency and the degree to which it has accomplished its purposes, its cost-effectiveness and the efficiency of its operations, and practical and more efficient alternative approaches to achieving presently demonstrated regulatory needs.

(6) Each plan submitted by the President shall be submitted to the appropriate legislative and oversight committees of the House and Senate and the Committees on Government Operations which shall report bills approving or disapproving in whole or part the plans, together with such amendments as may be deemed appropriate. Such bills shall become the pending business in each House not later than the first day of May of the following year.

(7) If no plan is approved by August 1 of the following year, the affected departments and agencies shall have no authority to promulgate new rules and regulations except those essential for preserving public health and safety, but subject to congressional veto by concurrent resolution.

(8) If a comprehensive regulatory reform plan is not enacted by October 1st of the following year, then all affected departments and agencies shall lose all authority to enforce any rule or regulation except those essential to preserving public health and safety, again subject to congressional veto.

(9) In the event that no comprehensive regulatory reform plan has been enacted by the last day of December in the following year, all agencies affected by the plan shall be terminated unless appropriate provisions for their continuation are made by enactment of Congress.

(10) The timetable would be repeated beginning in 1997, in the ninth year following completion of the first eight-year timetable. This will ensure continuing review of the regulatory process, with a reasonable interim period to monitor the process before the comprehensive cycle begins anew.

GEN. THADDEUS KOSCIUSZKO DAY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in commemorating and recognizing the contributions of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko to our Nation's heritage.

Insofar as we Americans have always

held in high esteem that pioneer spirit which has made our Nation so strong and prosperous, we must also acknowledge the courageous and noble contributions of all those hardy immigrants who left their homeland to come and dedicate their efforts and commitments to a country still in its birth pangs. Thaddeus Kosciuszko was one such individual. Arriving in America during the turbulent year of 1776, he fought with our Revolutionary Army as a colonel of engineers, distinguishing himself in New York and the Carolinas, as well as engineering the fortification of West Point. At the close of the Revolution he received the deepest gratitude of Congress, the privilege of a well-deserved American citizenship and was promoted to the rank of brigadier general.

So it is with renewed spirit of acknowledgment and thanks that we take a special day to honor a gentleman who left behind him a legacy of loyalty, accomplishments, and an example for future generations to follow. Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko left America in order to help lead his homeland's struggle for independence, an effort and desire as sincere and devoted as that known of him in the American Revolution. Although his determination to attain liberty for the Polish people fell short of victory and resulted in his untimely death in 1817, General Kosciuszko has become a symbol of an ethnic pride that integrates itself with a blend of other rich and diverse cultures, for the promotion of a more unique and humane society.

As the Representative of that region in New York State (in particularly West Point) where General Kosciuszko served and where he formed lifelong friendships, I am honored to join with the many others taking this time to observe the birthday of both a great leader in the cause of the American war of independence and a brave Polish patriot.●

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FTC

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, along with my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. RINALDO), I am introducing legislation authorizing appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission. The bill also contains several substantive amendments to the FTC Act which we believe would significantly improve the operations of the Commission. For example, the bill contains a legislative veto provision virtually identical to that which passed the House during the 95th Congress. The FTC has proposed a number of rules on a wide range of topics and the gentleman from New Jersey and I both feel it is important to get this provision in place as soon as possible to guarantee more effective oversight of the Commission's rule-making activities. The bill would also exempt saving and loan institutions from the jurisdiction of the FTC. In-

stead, the bill would require the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to issue rules which would apply to savings and loans paralleling those issued by the FTC. This regulatory scheme is the same as that which now applies to banks. Finally, the bill contains provisions designed to enable the Commission to better monitor the impact of its rules. The bill would require, among other things, that the agency consider regulatory and nonregulatory alternatives and analyze the economic impact of its proposed rules, determine that a rule is not in conflict with or duplicative of a rule issued by another agency and review rules 5 years after they have been issued to determine whether the rules continue to be needed and are carrying out the purposes they were designed to carry out at the time they were promulgated.

We believe that enactment of this bill would greatly improve the workings of the FTC.●

CARTER FOREIGN POLICY: SPLENDID OSCILLATION

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, George Bush was America's special envoy to the People's Republic of China. He served 2 years as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. He was Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. He is a distinguished former Member of Congress.

When George Bush talks about America's position in the world, he speaks from years of frontline experience.

When George Bush talks about SALT II diplomatic relations with mainland China, and the need for a strong intelligence agency, the Congress is well advised to listen.

I commend to the attention of the House a speech by George Bush to the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service, given January 25, 1979:

SPEECH BY GEORGE BUSH TO GEORGETOWN
UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF FOREIGN SERVICE

As we start a new year, I am struck by the volume and amplitude of anxiety felt by Americans.

In travelling about the country, I find that many are losing their confidence in the ability of our leaders—not just in politics but in education, business, and other endeavors—to cope with the problems of our time and to convey a sense of purpose and direction. Vermont Royster, a dean of American journalism, has properly said that our society seems to be afflicted with "free floating anxiety" about the future.

In trying to find what has happened to us, I think one answer that is quite clear is that here at home—in our domestic affairs—the organizing principles of our society have begun to crumble. During the 1930s and 1940s, a general consensus grew up in the Nation that we could solve most of our social and institutional problems through the power of central government. That belief reached its zenith, perhaps, in the 1960s, but as the earthquake of proposition 13 reminded us last summer, the 60s are now over in the United States.

We have come into a new era in which people no longer regard government as efficient, nor even benevolent. It has become too big, too powerful, too wasteful—and I am sure you could add many epithets of your own. Thus, we are in search of new organizing principles here at home.

It is worth reminding ourselves that we are by no means unique in this regard.

The bandwagon against big government is rolling through many other western nations, and where it will stop, no one really knows. This past December, one of the most thoughtful editors of the Economist, Norman MacRae, completed a tour of the United States, Canada, Australia, South Africa and Britain, and in a lengthy report, he wrote that: "Across the English-speaking world, the system of Government is breaking down . . . there is probably going to be a great deal of unpleasantness as the next stage unfolds."

The challenges at home—inflation, unemployment, strengthening family life, and maintaining a sense of social cohesion—are thus much the same for all of us.

Yet, I would argue here this afternoon that in addressing these issues here at home—as we must—that we must pay no less heed to the issues that are facing us abroad, for the threat to our society from across the waters is no less important. Indeed, it appears to be mounting rapidly.

All of us have recognized for some time that the organizing principles of our domestic life were beginning to lose their staying power; but it has only been in the past few months that we have been forcefully taught that the principles of our foreign policy are also wearing thin. As our links with one nation after another are smashed to bits—Afghanistan, South Yemen, Ethiopia, and now, Iran—America can no longer turn a blind eye to what is happening in the world. It is time to sound the alarm.

After World War II, the United States developed a fairly coherent approach to world affairs, one that was supported by members of both political parties. In general, we were successful: We provided an umbrella of security for Europe and Japan to recover from their devastation; our policy encouraged the evolution of the peoples of the Third World away from colonialism and toward independence. As a result America enjoyed several years of relative prosperity and peace.

But now as we prepare for the 80s, we find that our consensus on foreign policy has been shattered. Vietnam split away millions of people, many young, some old, who concluded that America's role in the world should be curtailed. Arnold Toynbee once said that America is like a big dog in a small room: Every time it wags its tail, it knocks over a chair. But many of the anti-Vietnam protesters of the 60s thought it was much worse than that: They believed—and their beliefs were fueled by the revisionists on many of our campuses—that America is an arrogant, reactionary power that is a source of great mischief in the world. In effect, they have become the new isolationists, for they want the United States to ignore international affairs and let the world go its merry way—even if that means the destruction of free institutions and friendly countries.

On the other hand, I believe the great majority of Americans believe that America has a responsible role to play and that, if we withdraw, the world is much more likely to slide toward totalitarianism. It is among this group—and I count myself as one of them—that there is now mounting concern about the trend of recent events beyond our shores.

Out most immediate problem as a nation is that our current foreign policy seems to be one of splendid oscillation. One day, our Government speaks about our responsibility

as a world leader in the face of a growing Soviet menace; the next day, our President tells us that we should no longer have "an inordinate fear of communism." One day, our naval fleet is ordered from the Philippines to a position just off Iran; the next day, the signals are changed, and it is told to cut figure eights in the South China sea. One day, we inform our allies that we want their support in order to build a neutron bomb—support that Chancellor Schmidt of Germany then courageously gave us; the next day, we inexplicably announce that we do not intend to build a neutron bomb, at least for the foreseeable future. Thus, our policy has zigged and zagged from being tough one day, to soft and mushy the next.

It is this very indecisiveness, this shilly-shallying that reflects I believe both a lack of consensus within the Government and within the country. Within the Government itself, there appear to be major divisions between those at the highest levels, especially at the National Security Council, and those in second level position, especially in the State Department. The hawks are at NSC; the doves at State; and as they squabble, American tail feathers are being scattered around the world.

Similarly, within the country at large, there is now a lack of consensus about the nature and purpose of American power abroad. There is a distinct sense of drift. We no longer have a clear sense of what we should be doing or what kind of world we are trying to build.

When I was young, and my dad was serving in the United States Senate with Arthur Vandenberg, he always taught me it was very important that politics stop at the water's edge. And for many years it did. But with our foreign policy consensus having been hammered into oblivion on the anvil of Vietnam, times have changed. Now, as we search for a new framework for our foreign policy—just as we search for a new framework in domestic policy—I think all of us should speak our minds, recognizing that the world does not yield to simple answers and that reasonable men can disagree.

I would like to advance a few ideas that I believe are fundamental to U.S. foreign policy in the future.

I always begin with two basic propositions.

First, I think we have to recognize that our greatest adversary in world affairs is still the Soviet Union and that the motivating force in Soviet policy is to achieve dominance in the world. It would be soothing to think that all the Soviets want to cooperate, but for reasons that strike deep into the Russian psyche, I believe that their goal is more ambitious. The evidence seems irrefutable:

Since 1962, the Soviets have poured between 14 and 18 percent of their GNP into their armed forces.

Their total spending on arms is more than 45 percent larger than U.S. military spending, and as you know, more than half of our own defense budget goes into pensions and salaries.

As a result of their dramatic investments, Soviet ground forces now outnumber U.S. ground forces by virtually every criterion.

The Soviets have not only built up overwhelming superiority in conventional forces but they have surpassed us in many areas of strategic armaments, including the SS-17 and the SS-19, both of which are capable of MIRVing.

Accompanying their growth in armaments has been an ambitious civil defense program.

They are also spending millions of dollars on anti-satellite technology and from public sources, we find evidence of frightening new laser research.

Finally, and equally important, we confront Soviet adventurism around the world. Their Cuban mercenaries—40,000 strong—are now planted in at least 24 different

countries in Africa: their Vietnam proxies—100,000 strong—have swept aside the government in Cambodia; and the Soviets themselves are daily beaming radio broadcasts into Iran, telling the people there how perfidious the United States has been.

Personally, I do not understand how anyone could review all of the evidence without concluding that the Soviets are probing and testing our will.

And the central challenge they present is not one of overwhelming us with their nuclear weaponry—though that is always a grave possibility—but of slowly, inexorably breaking the links between the United States and its friends abroad.

That is why, in many respects, it does not necessarily serve Soviet intentions to convert Iran into a pro-Soviet state; what will serve their purposes equally well is to destroy Iran's ties to the west, turning it into a non-aligned, perhaps radicalized state with policies paralleling those of a nation like Libya. That is the true nightmare that should haunt the White House today.

The second proposition that I want to advance this afternoon is that in light of this challenge, the overreaching responsibility of the United States in world affairs is to be the leader in preserving man's hope for freedom.

The President said in his State of the Union address this week that we need a "new foundation." In foreign affairs I completely agree. We do need a new foundation.

First, we must show more respect and understanding in the way we treat other nations that are friends and allies who share our commitments.

I deeply believe in the struggle for human rights and I believe that the United States should be the champions of that struggle; but I do not believe that we advance that goal—and certainly, we weaken our alliances and friendships—by publicly kicking around nations like Argentina and Brazil while moving closer to a repressive regime like Cuba. Similarly, I cannot understand what purpose is advanced by continually sanctioning South Africa while remaining virtually silent about the atrocities committed in Cambodia. Let us press forward for human rights, but let us do so in harmony with our other goals.

Second, I am convinced that we must put more backbone into our posture regarding the Soviet Union. We cannot confuse detente with dismissal of our world obligations: We cannot confuse accommodation with appeasement. I do not mean that we must suddenly engage in sabre rattling; negotiations must continue to be a vital part of our relationship; but I do mean that we must be willing to recognize our interests in the world and to stand firm in protecting them. As Winston Churchill said: "We cannot parley unless we arm. We cannot negotiate unless through strength."

In coming weeks, the President is likely to conclude a SALT II agreement with President Brezhnev and the nation will be pitched headlong into vigorous debate over foreign policy. With the terms of the treaty not yet available, it is premature to judge it on the merits. It is not too early, however, to express concern about the way that the President has unilaterally given up so many bargaining chips—the B-1, the neutron bomb, naval modernization, and the rest—without winning anything in return.

It is not too early to insist that in order to be acceptable, the treaty must contain adequate provisions on verification. And certainly, it is not too early to make it clear that a SALT agreement must be voted on within the context of overall Soviet behavior: The United States must not allow a nuclear weapons treaty to serve as protective cover for Soviet adventurism around the world.

Third, I believe it imperative that as a great power, the United States maintain its credibility with both friend and foe alike. Throughout the postwar period, American credibility—joined with American military strength—has been the binding force that has held the free world together. But that credibility has been badly eroded. We must reaffirm a basic principle: When the United States of America speaks, it must be believed; when it makes promises, it must keep them.

Those of you who are familiar with my record in public life know that I have long argued we should establish formal diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China. I thus welcomed the initial effort of the current administration to move in that direction. But I was startled—and deeply dismayed—by the terms of the final agreement. The United States, incredibly enough, agreed to all three of China's basic demands—abrogation of the defense treaty, removal of our troops, and de-recognition of the Taiwan government—but abandoned the only demand that we had ever made of the Chinese:

To guarantee that the issue of Taiwan would be peacefully resolved. We gave all, and got nothing in return—and in the process, we wrecked our credibility in anxious capitals around the world, stretching from Seoul to Tel Aviv.

Unfortunately, the impression is rapidly taking hold that we have treated the Iranian question in much the same way. No one can be certain whether a government that included the Shah could be maintained, but it is abundantly clear that our on again, off again statements about him did much to hasten his departure. It is also clear, I think, that our hesitancy in responding to Soviet demands stimulated grave doubts in Iran—and frankly, in other nations such as Saudi Arabia—that we would be weak and pusillanimous in dealing with the issue.

Once again, our credibility suffered, and our influence and respect slipped several notches in other capitals. In coming years, nothing can be more important to the success of our foreign policy than to restore our credibility abroad.

A fourth conclusion that I would argue this afternoon is that in order to be a great power, we must have eyes and ears to understand what is going on around us. If the Iranian experience has taught us anything, it is surely the need for a healthy, operational intelligence community.

As one who believed that some reform was needed in our intelligence community and has appreciated many of the steps that have been taken, I would say to you that it is time to stop tearing down the CIA and to give it a new start in life.

Finally, I would urge that if we wish to be a great power in the world, then we must believe once again in our greatness as people. I was struck recently by the article written by the French playwright, Eugene Ionesco, after a stay in the United States. "Americans," he said, "want to feel guilty. They have this need to be guilty . . . (but) that masochism which keeps on haunting Americans is more dangerous than anything mankind has wreaked upon itself for centuries and centuries."

Ionesco recognizes, as should we, that this is a nation that has done as much for the cause of humanity and more for the cause of freedom than any other nation that has ever inhabited this Earth. We are a good people. We are a decent people. And, if we are vigilant, if we have the will, if we have faith in ourselves, and we rediscover our sense of purpose, then we can continue to be the single greatest force for peace that man has ever known.

That is a noble destiny, but it is a destiny that can be ours. In coming days, as a

great debate unfolds about American foreign policy, let us make that once against our highest goal. ●

HOME FINANCE LEVERAGING ACT OF 1979

HON. GERALDINE A. FERRARO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today legislation which, if enacted, will insure that our urban areas can fully utilize a \$700 million loan program sponsored by the Federal National Mortgage Association (FNMA).

My legislation, the "Home Finance Leveraging Act of 1979," would exempt programs of FNMA from State usury laws. This would allow States with mortgage ceilings considerably below the market rate to participate in FNMA's urban loan participation program.

Allow me to explain briefly what the urban loan program is and why my State of New York, 17 other States, and Puerto Rico are currently inhibited from full participation in it.

The urban loan participation program began in the winter of 1978 as a \$200 million program. On February 5, 1979, \$500 million was added to its authority. It works this way. When a mortgage lender in an urban area has invested at least \$250,000 in mortgages, he may form them into a pool and sell 60 to 90 percent of that pool to FNMA. FNMA then sells that percentage to private investors at biweekly auctions. The investors bid on the interest yields for the loans. The low bidder buys the loan. FNMA then funnels the money back to the original investor at the interest rate set by auction. The lender is required to reinvest that money in an urban home or business. The purpose of the program is to provide liquidity for mortgages in areas where money has dried up due to tight monetary policy.

New York, for example, is hindered from participating in this program because its usury laws set an interest ceiling at 9.5 percent for State-chartered banks and one point over the Federal discount rate for federally regulated banks (currently the ceiling for these banks is at 10.5 percent). Unfortunately the interest rates at which FNMA participations have been going out is presently around 11.1 percent. Obviously, a bank will not take money from FNMA at 11.1 percent when it can only lend it back at 9.5 or 10.5 percent.

My district, like those of many of my colleagues, is in desperate need of additional mortgage money. I am convinced that homeowners and commercial interests in my area are willing to pay a little extra for this money if it can be made available.

In my view, at a time when we in Congress are trying to cut our deficits—while still working to stimulate the economy—this urban loan program is a fresh approach. I should point out to my colleagues that no taxpayer dollars are expended on this program. Rather, it is a

means of leveraging private investment in our urban areas.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will be interested to know there is legislative precedent for a so-called Federal override of State usury laws. In 1975 Public Law 94-50 included a provision which exempted activities under the Emergency Home Purchase Act of 1974 from State usury laws. Legislation containing this provision was passed in the Senate by a 64-to-256 vote, and in the House by a vote of 321 to 21.

The Home Finance Leveraging Act will make FNMA's urban loan participation program effective in all 50 States. The States which are currently inhibited from utilizing the program contain about 53 percent of this country's urban population. Clearly, we must remove the roadblocks which prevent more than half of the intended beneficiaries of the program from reaping its benefits.

Mr. Speaker, when the President announced his national urban program last year he called for a "new partnership" between the public and private sectors in rebuilding our cities. FNMA's urban loan participation is intended as part of that partnership. The private sector has demonstrated its willingness to participate in the program in areas where it is feasible. Now it is time for the public sector to hold up its end of the partnership by allowing all 50 States and the territories to participate in the program. I urge my colleagues to join me in sponsoring the legislation I have introduced today.

I am inserting in the RECORD background information on FNMA and the urban loan participation program. Also included is a list of the States which have usury laws inhibiting their use of the program.

The information follows:

FNMA AND THE URBAN LOAN PARTICIPATION PROGRAM

WHAT IS THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION?

The Federal National Mortgage Association, also known as FNMA or Fannie Mae, is an independent private stockholder-owned corporation the activities of which are sanctioned by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

With assets of \$38 billion, FNMA stock is listed on all major exchanges in the country. It is the nation's largest investor in residential mortgages.

FNMA does not deal directly with homeowners or potential home buyers. Rather, it purchases mortgages from financial institutions which make mortgage loans directly to consumers. Participating institutions include, mortgage banking companies, commercial banks, savings and loan associations, life insurance companies, mutual savings banks, and credit unions.

WHAT IS THE URBAN LOAN PARTICIPATION PROGRAM?

To provide liquidity to lenders who invest in urban loans, FNMA will purchase 60% to 90% of a pool of mortgages on residential properties located in older urban areas. The stipulation is that the funds which FNMA contributes will then be re-invested in an urban area. Therefore for every dollar a participating institution invests in the urban area, FNMA will contribute another 60 to 90 cents. FNMA encourages institutions to participate in the program by reducing the paperwork usually required by the association.

After expressing its intent to "purchase"

the loans, FNMA sells them at biweekly auctions. The bids are over the interest yield of the loans. The lowest bidder may purchase the loans. Therefore, only private money is invested in the program. FNMA acts as a conduit between lender and purchaser.

WHY DO STATES WITH USURY LAWS HAVE PROBLEMS PARTICIPATING IN THE URBAN LOAN PROGRAM?

When the biweekly auctions are held by FNMA an interest-rate (or yield) for the loans is set. In recent weeks the accepted yield has been approximately 11.1%. In states which have mortgage rate ceilings below that level, local institutions would have to subsidize the interest paid by the borrower in order to meet the FNMA yield. Obviously, very few banks will participate in the program if they stand to lose money by doing so.

WHICH STATES ARE CURRENTLY INHIBITED FROM PARTICIPATING DUE TO USURY LAWS?

The following states have mortgage rate ceilings which inhibit their participation in this program: Arizona, Arkansas, California, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Louisiana, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, (Puerto Rico), South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, and West Virginia. These seventeen states represent 49% of the United States in population. (Sources: HUD and U.S. Census 1976 estimates).

AGRICULTURE INFLATION PROTECTION ACT OF 1979

HON. EDWARD R. MADIGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce, along with my colleague from Kansas, Mr. SEBELIUS, legislation that would provide corn and wheat farmers a 9½-percent increase in established target prices over the 1978 target price.

Our bill would guarantee farmers \$2.30 per bushel for corn and \$3.72 per bushel for wheat in 1979 if they participate in the set-aside programs. These increases in the target prices fall within the President's wage and price guidelines and would not contribute to inflation or raise food costs. The increased target prices would reflect the 9-percent cost of living increase for farmers in 1978. However, they are less than the 11-percent wage increase that farmers had to pay in 1978.

For the 1980 crop year, the bill would index target prices for corn and wheat in accordance with changes in the Consumer Price Index, or the Index of Prices Paid by Farmers, whichever is greater.

Also, the bill includes a proposal that would require the Secretary of Agriculture to announce provisions of the next year's feed grain program by October 15, rather than by November 15.

The Agriculture Inflation Protection Act of 1979, is not intended to guarantee profits to farmers at the expense of taxpayers. Its aim is to guarantee that farmers' prices increase with basic cost of living increases.

According to USDA, the cost of production for corn and wheat in 1978 was \$2.62 and \$3.72 per bushel, respectively.

This bill would not bring the target price for corn up to the farmer's cost of production. However, it would narrow the gap between the prices farmers receive for corn and their cost of production.

We hope that by increasing the target price by 9½ percent, more farmers will participate in the corn and wheat set-aside programs, which would help reduce surpluses next year, help strengthen the market price, and thus decrease Government payments to farmers.

The provision to advance the announcement date for the next year's feed grain program from November 15 to October 15, was included so farmers can avoid making last-minute decisions about their next year's crops. Despite promises made by the President last fall that the feed grain program would be announced by mid-October, the announcement was not made until November 11, 4 days before the legal deadline (and 4 days after the election).

This delayed announcement was directly responsible for many feed grain producers deciding not to participate in this year's set-aside program because they had already made production decisions for the spring.

Mr. Speaker, it is our hope that Congress will see fit to enact this bill into law in the next few weeks. Passage of this legislation would help farmers survive the cost-price squeeze they are facing until Congress can revise the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 which expires in 1981.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. ●

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: THE ROAD TO TOTAL ILLITERACY?

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, a recent Associated Press article quoted two education experts as saying that the United States is "lapsing back into illiteracy." One expert said that if this trend is not stopped we may have to import doctors, engineers, and scientists because American students simply will not be able to read well enough to do the necessary studying for those demanding professions.

These experts appeared before a Senate Human Resources Subcommittee. I have no doubt that the Congress will hear conflicting testimony from big education lobbyists whose vested interest is to keep the educational status quo. One way of keeping things the way they are is to create a Department of Education, which will be controlled by the Federal bureaucrats and the "Big Education" lobbyists who have dominated American education for the past 15 years with results such as this epidemic of illiteracy.

We must act quickly to stop this proposed department which will give immense power to those largely responsible for the deterioration of American education.

At this point I wish to include in the RECORD, "U.S. Lapsing Into Illiteracy, Author Says", from the Chicago Sun Times, February 14, 1979.

[From the Chicago Sun Times, Feb. 14, 1979]

U.S. LAPSING INTO ILLITERACY, AUTHOR SAYS

WASHINGTON.—America is "lapsing back into illiteracy" so fast that it may have to import doctors and scientists by the 1990s, the author of "Why Johnny Can't Read" testified Tuesday.

Rudolf Flesch, whose 1955 best-seller aroused many parents and earned him the enmity of the educational establishment, told the Senate Human Resources subcommittee on education that the United States may be in the position of the Third World in another dozen years.

If the trend isn't halted, he said, college graduate schools will deteriorate so badly by the 1990s that America "will have to import personnel to run the machinery."

"I honestly feel that if there is no change in the method of teaching reading, we will have to import doctors, engineers and scientists from France, Germany and Japan because we won't have enough," Flesch said.

He said that up to half the U.S. population is functionally illiterate. He said reading skill has been falling since 1925, when the current "look-say" method of instruction took hold.

That method, taught in 90 to 95 per cent of public schools, requires children to memorize the formation of words and associate them with pictures, a process Flesch said can take years.

He called for a return to the old "phonics" method, which teaches children how to apply the sounds of the alphabet to unknown words. Flesch said this process can be completed in months.

Also addressing the panel was Paul Copperman, president of the California-based Institute of Reading Development, who said that between 40 and 60 per cent of the June, 1979, high school graduates will not be able to read well enough to handle a clerk's job.

Copperman blamed permissiveness in the classroom, with ethnic studies taught instead of traditional disciplines, and legal and bureaucratic interference from Washington, such as school busing. ●

NO NEED FOR A SEPARATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

HON. DANIEL B. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Education and Labor Committee, which will have considerable input into the question of creating a separate U.S. Department of Education, I found the following two editorials most persuasive. The first is from my hometown newspaper, the Danville Commercial-News. The editorial points out the absurdity of the administration naming inflation as public enemy No. 1 and then turning around and creating a new Cabinet-level position with a department consisting of some 16,000 employees.

The second editorial, from the Washington Post, a newspaper not noted for its conservative views, describes the creation of a Department of Education as a "bad idea." The Post further observes

that such a department would become nothing more than a "gigantic single-minded lobbying outfit. It will be the NEA writ large." The editorial concludes that the best thing that could happen to this idea of a separate education department is for Congress to bury it.

I commend these editorials to the attention of my colleagues. The articles follow:

[From the Danville (Ill.) Commercial-News, Feb. 4, 1979]

NEW DEPARTMENT NOT THE ANSWER

Sinking scores in college entrance tests and the continued clamor for competency standards are signs that all is not well in classrooms across the country.

These arguments and others will be put forth by Carter administration officials pushing for a separate U.S. Department of Education before Congress, probably later this month.

The foremost consideration should be the cost. The same White House aides who will beat the drums for this government expansion are the ones who helped put together the presidential package naming inflation as the nation's public enemy No. 1.

Part of that package was a pledge to keep government spending down because it is known to be the biggest factor in the inflation spiral.

Setting up a new cabinet-level position with a department planning 16,000 employees and all the overhead that goes with it sounds like a big step away from inflation fighting.

Perhaps a good example of what to expect is the government's newest department—energy.

Energy Secretary James R. Schlesinger now has a deputy secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission chairman, and directors for hearings and appeals, economic opportunity, Economic Regulatory Administration, energy research and international affairs besides an inspector general.

Of course, each of these executives has assistants and all of them must have secretaries. Add the cost of office space, janitorial help and other expenses of government operation and the price tag becomes staggering.

This is for energy and everyone agreed that a rational, consistent federal policy on energy was needed. Energy conservation was once described by President Carter as the moral equivalent of war.

But even if money were no object, there is not the same agreement on the cures for education.

The impulse is to say a federal policy on education is needed. National standards for high school graduation might eventually mean that a high school diploma could be taken at face value.

But development of those standards also must take into account the added expense of upgrading schools in districts with low tax bases. And national standards for what and how much should be taught would soon lead to standards for determining who is qualified to teach it. This would then become a question of who hires teachers.

State, county and local school authorities could not be expected to give up their say-so as long as they represent such an overwhelming percentage of school revenue. The mere establishment of a separate education department at the federal level does not create more money for schools from the federal budget.

There are many questions that must be thoroughly aired and answered before a separate education department will make any sense. Policy, standards and spending breakdowns must be established before the department is created, not afterward.

Even if we could afford more bureaucracy, a new department of education is a serious policy decision and must be considered as such in Congress.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 11, 1979]

THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—AGAIN

Never underestimate the power of a bad idea to generate bad arguments. Vice President Mondale's remarks the other day in favor of the creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Education were an example. The vice president, in a briefing, made the point that the United States "is the only major industrial democracy in the world that does not have a department or a ministry of education," although, to our certain knowledge, this is neither a symptom nor a source of what is wrong with American education. Mr. Mondale, according to the news story, also suggested that education "suffers because its highest official 'is not at that Cabinet table speaking directly to the president.'"

You would hardly judge from any of this that the United States is also the only major industrial democracy (or any sort of country) in the world in which three-quarters of the children graduate from high school, and half of those graduates go on to college. And we also question whether, despite the proponents' assurances, a new federal department would not subtly and unwisely enlarge the federal jurisdiction in the schools. In theory anyway, education remains a primary function of the states and localities, which is surely one reason this country has not had a national ministry of education as part of its political tradition. We think it is a tradition worth holding on to.

It is, of course, true that much of the money for our public schools now comes from general revenues and that there has been a vast increase of federal involvement in public education over the past couple of decades. But both the money and the involvement can be managed by government instrumentalities now available to do so. It is argued by those who favor the new department that it would work pretty much as a harmless conduit of federal funds and coordinator of federal programs, all the while respecting the primacy of the states and localities in school affairs, and that it would do all this much more efficiently than is done under the present slovenly dispensation. Consulting ancient and modern bureaucratic precedent and looking around us at the evidence of our senses, we discover no reason at all to believe this is how things will turn out. They never do. Look at the Labor Department. Look at Commerce. A Department of Education, if such unfortunately is enacted into law, will become a gigantic single-minded lobbying outfit. It will be the NEA writ large.

Anyone who observed last year's congressional proceedings on this subject—the hearings, committee debates and so forth—should understand that what we really have here is a fight over turf: who gets which hunk of jurisdiction over whom and what and how much money. Evidently the administration, in coming back with its Education Department legislation in this Congress, has carved up the turf in a new and politically more persuasive way, so that the proposal is likely to have a smoother time this year. We hope it does not. The purpose of the federal government—as we keep harping when this proposal comes up—should be to fit federal education programs into a system of priorities and values larger than the education industry's perspective permits it to see, not to break off those programs into a client- and constituent-run principality of its own.

The best thing that could happen to President Carter's proposal for a department of education, from his point of view and everyone else's, would be for Congress to bury it. ●

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JAMES J. BLANCHARD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, February 24, marked the 61st anniversary of Estonian independence. Once again we are reminded of the ongoing struggle to bring freedom back to the people of Estonia and the Baltic region.

Estonia, like its Baltic neighbors, Lithuania and Latvia, still suffers from Soviet domination and russification efforts. These are people who seek only to reestablish their own independence, to freely practice their own religion, and to maintain their own cultural heritage. Today, in the face of Soviet adversity, they still display a strong spirit and commitment to these goals.

Those of us who enjoy these freedoms today are the natural allies of the Estonian people. For the Estonians and other people of the captive nations represent some of the strongest advocates for the kind of rights and freedoms that we hold so dear. I hope that all of my colleagues will join with me in taking this opportunity, on the 61st anniversary of Estonian independence, to lend their full support for the cause of freedom and self-determination for the people of Estonia.

I also want to take this opportunity to bring the following statement from the Estonian American National Council to my colleagues' attention. This statement aptly explains the need for our support.

The statement follows:

A STATEMENT ON THE OCCASION OF THE 61ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF THE REPUBLIC OF ESTONIA

After centuries of foreign rule the independence of Estonia was proclaimed on February 24, 1918.

Immediately thereafter, the German Army occupied the country, a situation which lasted until World War I armistice in November 1918.

Subsequently, the Russian Bolshevik Army attacked Estonia with the aim of imposing the Communist system upon the Estonian people. The young Republic was forced to protect itself and to resist the invaders in order to secure and maintain its independence.

The Provisional Government adopted the principle: "No compromise with the Communists". The die had been cast! The Estonian War of Independence started on November 28, 1918 and was concluded successfully on January 3, 1920.

Great Britain, Finland, Sweden and Denmark provided either financial support or volunteer troops to assist the young Republic in fighting off the aggressors. The young Estonian Army, with this aid, and the unstinting support of the population at large, rapidly developed into a fierce fighting force for the independence of its nation. On February 2, 1920 a Peace Treaty was signed between the Republic of Estonia and the Soviet Socialist Republic of Russia by which the latter "... agreed to renounce voluntarily forever all rights over Estonian territory and people".

Recently, the Estonians in the free world commemorated the 60th anniversary of the beginning of the successful War of Independence. To the present time it has re-

mained a symbol of self-sacrifice and inspiration for all those who are concerned with the cause of Estonia.

The spirit of this heroic struggle is also a source of inspiration in Soviet occupied Estonia, especially for younger generation, who want to know more about the "real history" of the Estonian people, instead of the falsehoods perpetuated by the Soviet regime.

The deal between Hitler and Stalin of August 23, 1939, known as the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, condemned Estonia and her neighbors Latvia and Lithuania to the Soviet sphere of influence. This was the initial event which led to the willful Soviet breach of all solemn treaty obligations with the three Baltic countries and culminated in their forceful annexation in 1940.

The Soviet-imposed rule in Estonia has brought with it untold sufferings—arrests, deportations, executions as well as the so-called nationalization of all private property and the down-grading of social and working conditions. But above all fundamental freedoms have virtually been abolished.

One of the most threatening aspects for the Estonian people is the Russianization process, the aim of which is the destruction of the Estonian nation.

We are hopeful, that President Carter's human rights policy in conjunction with the Helsinki CSCE follow-up meetings will serve as an effective weapon for liberalization of the current repressive policies practiced by the Soviet Union in Estonia and in other Baltic States of Latvia and Lithuania.

Of considerable moral support for the Estonian people is also the fact that the United States as well as a great number of other Western countries have not recognized the forcible annexation of Estonia by the Soviet Union.

On this sixty-first anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Estonia all freedom-loving Estonians once more appeal to world public opinion to support the cause of freedom and justice for the Estonian people. ●

THE ADMINISTRATION'S "OPEN" CHINA POLICY

HON. DAN QUAYLE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. Speaker, when I think about the China policy which the Carter administration has proposed for this Nation, I cannot help but wonder at the remarkable gap which exists between the morally righteous image the President's public relations specialists like to project, and the reality that lies underneath. Only 2 years ago we were given pledges of an "open administration" which was to be above-board and honest in its dealings with the American people. And only recently the President has reiterated for us his longstanding advocacy of human rights by claiming that human rights is the "soul of our foreign policy."

The hard facts suggest, however, that Mr. Carter's commitment to human rights, like his administration's superficial policy of openness, is only skin-deep. A recent case in point is our Government's expulsion from the United States of a diplomat from Taiwan who committed the unpardonable offense of speaking out on behalf of his country and against Mr. Carter's China posture.

I-Cheng Loh, the Minister of Information at the Republic of China's Embassy, wrote two letters to American newspapers—one to the New York Times on January 23 and one to the New York Daily News on December 26—in which he criticized the terms of Mr. Carter's normalization agreement with Peking and presented his country's view of the situation. As a result, pressure was applied on Taipei by the State Department for Loh's immediate recall from the United States. Apparently operating under the threat that if Loh were not recalled he would be forced to leave, the Republic of China complied and Loh was quickly and unceremoniously withdrawn.

I have to wonder why our State Department is so sensitive to criticism. Is their insecurity or fear of the truth so great that they are unwilling to allow the American people to read views contrary to the administration's official line? Is not freedom of speech a "human right" in this country, and is not access to contending points of view the least that we as Americans can expect under an "open administration"?

It is important, Mr. Speaker, that the American people and Members of this Congress be made aware of the abysmal way in which this administration has dealt with our Chinese friends on Taiwan and, indeed, the way in which it has sought to stifle the flow of information which might be critical of its own policies. Accordingly, I am asking that Mr. Loh's article of December 26 be reprinted in the RECORD, along with the recent report of his recall from the United States. Reading both should be, for anyone, an edifying experience:

TAIWAN RECALLS DIPLOMAT WHO SCORED U.S. POLICY

(By Dan Morgan)

A New York-based Taiwan official who criticized the Carter administration's China policy in letters to U.S. newspapers was recalled last week after telling friends that the State Department had sought his withdrawal.

The State Department declined to comment on the incident, which involves the sudden departure for Taiwan on Jan. 23 of I-Cheng Loh, a veteran of 15 years' service in the United States and currently director of the China Information Service in New York City.

A spokesman for Taiwan's liaison office in Washington, describing the matter as "delicate," said that Loh had been called back for "consultation." The spokesman added that Loh would get a new assignment and "probably will not come back."

However, Ray S. Cline, director of Washington's Center for Strategic and International Studies and a critic of President Carter's China policy, said:

"The State Department brought pressure to bear leading to 'Gene' Loh's withdrawal on a short deadline."

According to one version, on which the State Department refused to comment, the U.S. government advised Taiwan around Jan. 19 that Loh should be withdrawn from the country within 72 hours or he would be asked to leave on grounds of un-diplomatic conduct.

Loh left on the same day that his letter appeared in The New York Times saying that "unless Peking forsakes communism and restores freedom to the people of China, there will be no negotiations with Peking."

On Dec. 26, the New York Daily News published a longer letter in which Loh said that he could "see why the leaders of Israel are nervous about the value of American promises."

Loh's letter went on to urge that friends of Taiwan "write senators and congressmen urging Congress to adopt resolutions guaranteeing that adequate defense supplies will be sold to Taiwan," and describing the American initiatives as "shabby treatment" for the 17 million people of Taiwan.

The Carter administration has been moving ahead with its plan for setting up a private corporation to handle U.S. relations with Taiwan, despite mounting congressional demands for greater security guarantees.

As of Jan. 1, Taiwan's embassy here was downgraded to the status of a liaison office. The Carter administration has been pressing Taiwan authorities to accept its plan for representation through a private corporation as of March 1, the same day that the United States begins full diplomatic relations with the Peoples Republic of China.

Taiwan's reluctance to accept this formula is seen by diplomatic observers as complicating the Carter administration's efforts to get Congress to authorize federal funding of a proposed private U.S. "institute" to handle trade and cultural relations.

Groups opposing President Carter's new China policy have been adding to the pressures on the administration with demonstrations and speeches. Pro-Taiwan organizations demonstrated yesterday against the visit of China's Vice Premier Teng Hsiao-ping. Chinese-language newspapers in the United States have carried advertisements calling on friends of Taiwan to demonstrate, and leading Taiwanese businessmen have placed advertisements in the Washington Post and other newspapers criticizing the Carter policy.

A Justice Department official said yesterday that there is no evidence so far that these activities violate the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

TAIWAN: "WE'LL FIGHT, WE'LL DIE FOR FREEDOM"

(By I-Cheng Loh)

Ever since Friday, Dec. 15, 9:08 p.m., the phones haven't stopped ringing in my home and my office. Hundreds of people called—most of them friends and a few total strangers—to express outrage and support, to offer sympathy and condolences. Everyone asked the same question: How do you feel? What are you going to do? Is there anything I can do to help?

How do I feel? I am very much saddened, of course, not only for my country—the Republic of China on Taiwan—but for the United States, which I have come to love and to regard as my second home.

This is the first time in its 202 years of history that the United States has turned her back on a faithful friend and a loyal ally, not because of what that friend has done, but because a third party—a former adversary directly responsible for the loss of American lives in Korea and in Vietnam—demanded it.

This is the first time, as far as I know, that the United States has abrogated a treaty ratified by the Senate, which has the effect of law, in exchange for a promise that the third party refused to give.

This is the first time that an American commitment, solemnly given and gratefully received, was broken and shattered to pieces, not because America was weak, but because the adversary was erroneously perceived to be too strong.

I must say that I can see why the leaders of Israel are nervous about the value of American promises.

What are we going to do? My answers usually come as a surprise to questioners: Nothing. Or more precisely, we will keep on doing the things that we have always been doing. Nothing less but nothing more.

The Republic of China on Taiwan will never negotiate with the Chinese Communists, be it Teng or Hua or whoever will be in power after the next round of purges and upheavals. We will never "play the Russian card," which some of our friends, driven to exasperation by the cynicism of the recent U.S. move in the power game, urged us to threaten to do.

Our reasons are simple. We must remain true to our beliefs, our moral standards, regardless of what others have done.

Neither will we "go nuclear," even if the technology is there. The only nuclear programs Taiwan will engage in are power-generation plants, which by 1984 will provide almost half of the country's needs for electricity.

We will hold fast to the three principles taught us by the late Dr. Sun Yat-sen, father of the republic on nationalism, democracy and social and economic well-being for our people.

We will build upon our already booming economy with a real gross national product growth of 12 percent in 1978, and a per capita income at \$1,300. We will bring Taiwan into the ranks of developed nations, not by the year 2000 but by 1985.

Is there anything you—as Americans—can do to help? Yes, there's plenty every conscientious American can do, now and well into the future.

First and most important, we ask you to help in making sure that Taiwan's security needs are amply met. Our 17 million people have not done anything wrong to deserve this shabby treatment.

Their only "sin" is their determination to remain free.

They deserve your help. Write the White House to tell the President what you think of his recent decision, and to voice your concern that Taiwan—with more people than 113 countries of the United Nations—must not be allowed to fall into Communist hands.

Write your senators and your congressmen, urging Congress to adopt resolutions guaranteeing that adequate defense supplies will be sold to Taiwan, not just in the next few years, but anytime in the future.

Ask your elected representatives to thoroughly debate every facet of the many questions concerning Taiwan's security, not just the black and white question of whether the Communists will attempt to "liberate Taiwan" by force.

It is vital to include in these discussions the gray areas, such as the possibility of naval blockade and economic strangulation through blacklisting and other means.

If, for example, a couple of months or years from now, Iran blows up and embroils the entire Middle East, the Chinese Communist regime could seize that opportunity to announce that as the "sole legal government of China" it is closing the ports of Taiwan to all foreign shipping as it indeed has .the legal right to do.

What can the United States do then that does not run contrary to the communique of Dec. 15?

Free China will stand on her own two feet. We will fight and die, if necessary, to preserve our prosperity built on an open society and free enterprise.

If such a time comes, we don't need your men, only your arms. If an adequate supply is promised by Congress for the unlimited future, such a day may never come to pass. ●

THE CHINA CARD

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has already been said about the administration's decision to sever diplomatic ties with Taiwan in favor of those with the People's Republic. And a great deal more needs to be said. Day by day, as administration witnesses present the President's position before our House and Senate Foreign Affairs Committees, the veneer of soundness with which the White House has cloaked its policies becomes more transparent.

The reality is this: The United States has conceded all demands made by the People's Republic of China as its preconditions for normalization, but has failed to receive any firm assurances whatsoever regarding the continued security of Taiwan. Further, the administration is resisting any meaningful attempt by this Congress to unilaterally provide such assurances. We are told that this is "unnecessary." Unnecessary for whom, I might ask. Certainly not for Taiwan, nor for the United States.

In other words, both in its negotiations with Peking and now in its representations to Congress, the administration has failed to adequately articulate and safeguard the interests of the United States or of Taiwan, but has instead let Peking determine American policy. This is a situation which we in the Congress, who share the responsibility for setting the foreign policy of this country, cannot allow to continue. Not if we hope to preserve our own self-respect and that of other foreign nations.

We will have presented Taiwan with a grave threat to its very existence as a free society if we fail in our deliberations here to provide for some form of government-to-government relations, or for some hard and specific assurances to the citizens of Taiwan that America will support them against any direct or indirect threat to either their territory or economy.

A recent commentary which appeared in New Republic forcefully illustrates the errors inherent in Mr. Carter's China policy. I commend it as a lucid analysis of the current situation as we attempt to chart a China policy for this country which is in truth based on both clear-eyed interest and firm moral principle. Accordingly, I insert the contents of the above-mentioned statement at this point in the RECORD:

THE CHINA CARD

The defense of small countries and threatened peoples has never counted much for Jimmy Carter. Already during his campaign for the presidency he signaled the Russians that he would not be a serious obstacle to any mischief they might undertake in Yugoslavia. In what he clearly takes to be a major

coup—amidst the chimney ash of the Middle East negotiations, the stalled SALT talks, the shambles of the regime of our pal the Shah, and the transparent failure of Carter's Saudi diplomacy over both oil prices and peace—the administration has now just about told the Chinese government in Peking that Taiwan is theirs for the taking. Of course, we expect that they won't return Taiwan, in Communist Party Chairman Hua Kuo-feng's chilling phrase, to "the embrace of the motherland" too quickly, at least not in the coming 12 months. Moreover, we'd certainly prefer that they not take the prosperous island and its 17 million people by force. But, as we've been hearing from the State Department pulpits, we don't even have private assurances on these matters. So much for the Taiwanese. Let those who count on us be warned.

There is no question that the U.S. and the People's Republic should have diplomatic relations, and good relations too. We should have had them, or tried to, for over a generation. Certainly we should never have maintained the fiction that the semi-retired warlords in forced exile on Formosa constituted the rightful government of China. In one of those painful ironies of history, it was Richard Nixon (doubtless persuaded by Henry Kissinger) who liberated us from our emotional commitment to the notion of one China run by Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang and its heirs.

Carter and his supporters seemed to assume that the most recent arrangements would bring the administration nearly unanimous plaudits. But once again they have underestimated the idealism of the American people, and our sense of moral obligation to nations and peoples trying to elude the grasp of tyranny. For, despite the much-heralded thaw in the latest version of the new China, a tyranny is exactly what China still is and is likely to remain. Its people are still in intellectual, political and moral chains, not to mention economic chains, even if the chains are a bit looser for the moment. Confronted by opposition they did not expect (that is, opposition across the political spectrum), White House supporters now rather more defensively trying to depict Carter as an instrument of historical inevitability. Whatever he and Zbigniew Brzezinski have negotiated with Peking follows irresistibly, we've been told, from the Shanghai Communiqué of 1972. But nothing is irresistible, a wise man once said, except that which is not resisted.

The terms of the new Sino-American deal are the terms set down long ago by the Chinese. And why should they have won in bargaining now what they could not win six years ago? Would they have refused our technical assistance or investments if we declined to break our ties with Taiwan? Indeed, if the current regime is so much more flexible and conciliatory than the one chaired by Chairman Mao, why did they insist upon—and why do we accept—the harshest conditions for normalization of relations? Yes, the Chinese did want a symbolic acceptance of their dominion over Taiwan. But that did not mean that we had to provide it. Surely Peking would not for sheerly symbolic reasons sabotage a liaison with the U.S. that is of enormous strategic importance to China. And if they would, what does that say for them as partners or for us as bargainers at the green table?

One suspects, of course, that it is not merely symbolic recognition of the People's Republic's sovereignty over Taiwan that was at stake. This is why the minimal concessions we obtained from Peking seem no more than a fig leaf covering our betrayal, not so much of the government of Taiwan as of its people. Neither a few defensive weapons sold to Taiwan nor continued trade with it will stop the erosion of will for an independent life among the island's population.

Skilled diplomacy, with a bit of backbone, should have been able to provide a way to recognize the reality on the mainland without ignoring the reality of a thriving, independent, pro-Western society on Taiwan.

And what have we gotten for changing the reality we choose to ignore? Not much, it appears. It is unlikely that the Soviets will be tamed or tempered by this diplomatic development. Instead we may find them more belligerent rather than less, a situation which President Carter's scandalously deceptive rendering of Leonid Brezhnev's message to him on the subject could not obscure. The China card, once played against Russia, is played for good. It may have made sense as graduate-seminar geopolitics, but it will not work in the real world. Part of the problem is that both Carter and Brzezinski are impatient and impulsive men. They have an idea and they try it. There'll always be other ideas to come. But the larger part of the problem is that they do not know how to bargain. Always seeking an opportunity to demonstrate deftness in negotiations, the president comes out looking, at best, half deft.

In negotiating with the Chinese, for example, we did not try to get them to trade off their very concrete and critical needs against their ideological desires. We did not even try to get them to curb their murderous clients in Phnom Penh. Indeed, one finds at State and among Brzezinski's partisans a barely repressed sympathy for the Cambodians who are, after all, anti-Vietnamese who are, after all, in turn pro-Soviet. The enemy of my enemy is my friend.

In this country, the most exuberant enthusiasts for Carter's card tricks are American corporations. Not chastened by what would have been the sobering experience of post-detente commerce with the Soviets, the American multinationals now see 800 million new customers for everything from Coca Cola to computers: a new market for our entire flotilla of technology and junk. *The Wall Street Journal*, clear-eyed as usual about the illusions that may grip the capitalist class, tried on December 28 to put up some cautionary signs, though they probably won't help. China most likely will not pay us with gold or hard currency, as they will in great measure pay the harder-nosed Japanese. They will pay us with our own credits, deflated dollar after deflated dollar, which will have the side-effect of intensifying the capital crunch at home.

All of this amounts to a pathetic performance for a great power, and yet another blot on the Presidency of its current steward Jimmy Carter. ●

WILLIAM AGEE SAYS "WE CAN WAKE THE GIANT"

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD a speech delivered by William Agee, chairman, president, and chief executive officer of the Bendix Corp., before the Idaho Forest Industry Council in Boise, Idaho. Mr. Agee is a graduate of Boise State Junior College, the University of Idaho, and Harvard Business School. He also replaced Michael Blumenthal as head of the Bendix Corp. when Blumenthal left the company to become Secretary of the Treasury, and Agee became the youngest chief

executive officer of a major U.S. corporation.

Mr. Agee covers some very important points in his speech on what has happened to this country's productivity and what he calls the Federal Government's "War on Innovation" which has been waged through inflation, taxation, economic uncertainty, and regulation. Agee believes, and I agree with him, that our country can and must wake up its economic system and "renew the vision we once had."

The speech follows:

WE CAN WAKE THE GIANT

(Speech by William M. Agee)

Governor Evans, Lt. Governor Batt, distinguished members of the Idaho legislature, fellow adventurers in the forest products industry, ladies and gentlemen.

It's nice to be asked to visit with a few friends from home. I say a few friends knowing that Louise Shaddock could have doubled the size of this audience by inviting all of last year's candidates for governor.

When I was asked to speak at this dinner, I almost refused. I could just hear my colleagues at Bendix begin to chuckle about my well-known affection for this state and this city. I think sometimes I bore them by talking up the merits of Idaho, but they're too polite—or something—to say so out loud. They think of Idaho as insulated from the outside world, not realizing that we all watch the same Walter Cronkite and John Chancellor. And Prime Minister Begin said that negotiating over the Middle East is a lot like dancing in an American discotheque: lots of motion and undulating, but darn little satisfaction.

In any case, it is good to be home, and I've surely got a business reason for the trip. The Bendix Corporation, which does not make washing machines, assuredly is in the forest products business. We changed the name of our forest products company last year from American Forest Products to Bendix Forest Products exactly to underline Bendix's deep, continuing commitment to this great industry.

Beyond the day-to-day worries about what housing starts will be in 1979, I see opportunity. I think the fundamental demographic facts of our time favor a robust forest products industry. I see a less cyclical industry, bolstered by the inalterable demand for housing.

In our industry, as in others, there are many upward pressures on price. Timber is a renewable resource, right enough, but only over time. That contributes to scarcity, as does the absolute demand for lumber that must follow from the post-war baby boom.

Another upward pressure on the price of wood products comes squarely from our social agenda. Over recent years, timber has become scarcer because so many trees have been taken out of the available pool by our national urgency about wilderness. In short, there is an economic cost to the consumer that comes from social accounting and the political response to it.

It seems to me that on balance, Secretary Bergland took a responsible step last month in his recommendations on Rare II. Yes, people in some parts of the country will be uncomfortable with what he proposed, and he may not be right in every detail. But I believe he took a positive step toward moderating the all-or-nothing approach to the wilderness question. He seems to recognize that we must almost always steer the middle course in reconciling the social and economic costs of a piece of legislation.

Part of the strain of being in the forest products business, as I'm sure you know, is convincing the public of what we know to be true. We have said that multiple use is the

most productive approach to forest lands. We've said that we make the fullest use of every tree we take, and that we replace each one. We've said that forests are a truly renewable resource. And yet, we can prove ourselves right on all those points and still not convince those for whom the very idea of wilderness is a cherished dream.

Perhaps now, when there is a growing realization that we must strike a balance between social and economic costs, we can add some ideas to our public information programs. According to the data I see, the dream of wilderness exists mostly in the minds of people with the least chance of ever seeing it. These are urban people, notably in the East, and they think of a wilderness bill as a way to put recreation in the bank. They see themselves, or their children, on vacation and at peace in the unspoiled lap of nature. How can they be against that?

The trouble is, that dream does not square with the word "wilderness" as it is used in our political dialogue. Yes, a few can enjoy the wilderness, if they're willing to take it on by boat, on foot, or on horseback. But for the majority, wilderness means no practical access. I think we need to make that point clear. We might go further by pointing out the huge availability of multiple use lands close to their teeming cities. And believe it or not, my friends, that point has great truth in it. Those in Detroit have Michigan's Upper Peninsula. New Yorkers have the Adirondacks, the Poconos, the Catskills. These realities seem to me more persuasive than a faint dream of wilderness locked up in the West.

Telling the truth in the name of lowering people's expectations is a nationwide political theme right now. Regrettably, we have a climate in which inflation is the major fear. We have a time when we seem bent on talking ourselves into a recession. And we have the reality that we are in a period where we will have slower growth in the economy. I happen to think there *will* be growth, but not at the fancy rates we're used to.

What this climate of caution means to me is that Americans are in a mood to listen to some home truths. These truths will be disagreeable in the short run, but our salvation in the fuller course of time. We are in a sobering-up period, if you like, after the hectic, noisy party of the Sixties and early Seventies.

Let me try a quick review of history. After the Second World War, and the Depression that preceded it, our focus was on getting the economy moving full tilt. The war had stopped up demand, and we were ready for an economic surge. Through the Forties, and most of the Fifties, we got it. In that period, there was not much attention paid to the idea of social cost. We thought very little of what we were doing to our country in the name of economic progress.

Then, after a little hitch in the economy in the late Fifties, the economy began to roll again. But this time, social consciousness was on a steep rise. Being rich as a nation, we began to have time for what one commentator has called "higher grumbles." We felt we could do everything, pay for everything, change everything—and in a very short period of time. The Sixties were a national high, and social costs came to count much more than the fundamentals of economics.

Now, we've reached a time to swing the pendulum back. It is, as I said, a time to tell ourselves some home truths.

We should be telling people right now that we must lower our expectations about the Social Security system. We have, as you know, a huge unfunded liability within this system. The word "billions" doesn't begin to describe it. Congress has religiously jacked up the Social Security tax, most recently to the tune of \$227 billion over the next ten years.

That doesn't solve the problem. Now, I'm not suggesting for a moment that we break

the social security promise to those in retirement or near it. We promised, and we should pay. But for younger people, who will soon be staggering to pay for a huge population of retirees, we must begin to adjust expectations. In short: the younger you are, the less you should expect to receive from Social Security. In substitution, we should encourage such ideas as the I.R.A., or individual retirement account, and the Keogh program to make personal saving for retirement attractive.

Social Security aside, it's time we put a decided tilt toward savings into our national economic thinking. Now is the time to de-emphasize economic theories that look only at the demand side of the economic equation. The chance to do so is there, because the growing public resistance to taxation and bulky government is evident everywhere—California, Michigan, and certainly here, where you are grappling with what the electorate said last fall. Indeed, across the nation, the people have spoken.

I won't say that I embrace every detail of every tax-cut proposal we saw on ballots across the nation last fall. But directionally, the idea of forcing government to sort out its spending programs and assign priorities to them is right. For so long, we have been so brashly sure that we can do everything, without cost or dislocation. In a fundamental sense, that era is gone, and my guess is that the voters have sensed it before their elected leaders have.

Now we have a backlash about spending and taxation, and we'll pay something for that. There will be interruptions of some government programs, and some valuable services may be hurt in the short run. But the gain that will come from concentrating the minds of government officials seems worth it. Voters, it seems to me, are not calling for no government at all. But they do want a calm, truthful exposition of what we need to spend and why. The call is not for callous indifference to social needs, but for intelligent frugality.

On another front, I see the need for an adjustment in our economic way of thinking. Recently, I've been privileged to serve as chairman of an advisory subcommittee on Economic and Trade Policy for the Department of Commerce. With other private-sector advisory committees, we are taking part in a government-wide Domestic Policy Review of innovation in this country. The question we have tried to answer is: what can the federal government do—or stop doing—to increase the rate of innovation and new business starts in America. For the sad fact is, my friends, that the fire in the belly that American entrepreneurs used to have is close to going out. President Carter, give him credit, recognized this, and ordered the highest level study of the problem.

Political leaders seem to like to declare war on things. We've had the war on poverty, and the moral equivalent of war on several other social ills. From what I've learned from our committee's work, I'd like to suggest that there has been another war going on, and that is the War on Innovation. It's an undeclared war, a war that almost no one set out to fight. No politician sold us on an attempt to crush the entrepreneurial spirit in this country. But effectively, that is what we've been doing for a long time. We have done it with inflation. We have done it with taxation. We have done it with economic uncertainty. And we have certainly done it with regulation.

Now I know that the urge to regulate business can arise from decent and thoughtful impulses to make the entire country better. And I know that we need regulation in many cases. And not every regulatory proposal brought up in the last 50 years has been evil in its result. But I have to say to you that our goal should be: balance and balance and balance. And the total regulatory burden on business, large or small, is

now out of balance. I don't think I'm far off in saying that the cumulative cost of government regulation is substantially in excess of \$100 billion. Now is the time to ask: what are we getting for that huge stack of dollars?

If the quick outline of history I gave a few moments ago is right, we have bounced back and forth, first paying great attention to economic growth at the expense of social considerations, then reversing ourselves. As a country, we have acted as if there could be no reconciliation of economic and social cost. And I ask myself: why not? We legislate too often as if we were choosing badly between good and evil. Our political rhetoric is such that a businessman who counsels caution and moderation gets described as an evil, polluting fat cat. And on the other side, a concerned citizen who worries, say about the safety of the work environment, gets painted as a subversive employee of the Kremlin. We seem to *hunt* for ways to divide ourselves, and when the rhetoric gets hot—when we get so divided that there must be winners and losers—then we all tend to wind up losing.

We so often legislate in a spirit of crisis and division, and when we do, we invariably overkill the problem we are trying to solve. That, I believe, is what has happened in the arena of government regulation. Clean air? Sure, but at reasonable cost. Safe factories? Of course, but there must be a better way to achieve it than filling the plants with paper and inspectors.

We have a great chance, right now, to calm down and collect our thoughts. I'd like to propose a "peace feeler"—or a cease fire, if you like—in the War on Innovation. Why can't we try, by law, a 12 month period in which we agree that there will be no new regulatory laws promulgated. I mean a temporary but total moratorium. Within that law, let's require that every existing regulatory agency publish their cost to benefit analysis. Let them answer this question: "All things considered, what did the public get from this or that regulation, and what did it cost to get it?" And finally, when the regulators produce their cost/benefit findings, let's make those findings subject to independent judicial review.

We just might wind up counting *all* the social costs of the activities of government. The cost of jobs that didn't get created. The cost of the tax burden. The cost in price increases. The increase in the sheer complexity of being an American citizen. And the cruelest cost of all—the cost of inflation. That's the bottom line. What is the social cost of mortgaged futures? What is the social cost to those living on deteriorating, fixed incomes?

It is time, my friends, that we quit tinkering at the margin in our struggle with inflation. That, in essence, is what wage-price guidelines are about. Up until now that is all that our current leadership has done—tinkered at the margin—using "old economic positions." We must encourage savings, reward investment and nurture innovation. The political climate is right to allow it, and so are the ideas themselves. Today, we see a Democratic President having turbulence within his own party because he is trying to reduce inflation by cutting the federal budget. It might seem tempting for a private-sector Republican like myself to sarcastically congratulate him for trying a Republican idea, but this is no time for cheap shots. He is right in what he's doing, even if he finds the prospect disagreeable. My only worry is that he will not feel able to go far enough.

I said before that we seem bent on talking ourselves into a recession. And yet it's ironic that while we hunker down, waiting for the blow, businessmen from all over the world are battering at this country's doors. They want a piece of our economic action. That is more because of our political stability

than because of our intrinsic economic health—at the moment. But we have plenty of economic muscle left, and they know it.

Since Americans think we can do anything, we tend to get disappointed when we fall short of excellence. We get down on ourselves. That's too bad, because we haven't lost the thread of this country's economic and social greatness. I think of our economic system as a giant. At the moment, the giant has an inflationary fever, and is sleeping it off after taking too much of the wrong kind of economic medicine. If we can strike the right chemical balance with an infusion of older remedies—savings, investment, productivity, de-regulation and innovation—we can renew the vision we once had. The older economic ideas can serve us again. If we try them, we can wake the giant.

Mr. Speaker, would not a 12-month period without any new rules and regulations be a breath of fresh air to Americans. We might even increase productivity for a change.●

ARMS SALES FOR THE YEMEN ARAB REPUBLIC

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1979

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, in the coming weeks, Congress will be considering several proposed arms sales to the Yemen Arab Republic (North Yemen), the Arabian Peninsula's most populous state. This country is presently ruled by a moderate government with close ties to Saudi Arabia, but it has recently experienced a series of assassinations and considerable instability.

These sales, which involve F-5 aircraft, armored personnel carriers and tanks, represent a substantial increase in American weapons sales to the Yemen Arab Republic. The United States has, in recent years, provided nearly \$140 million in arms to help modernize the Yemeni Army. These new proposals for arms to North Yemen, however, will amount to roughly \$400 million. These sales are to be financed by Saudi Arabia and may entail transfers to Yemen of some of this equipment from Saudi military inventories, presumably so that Yemen can receive the equipment more quickly.

Congress will need to scrutinize these sales carefully. Some Members may view the sales as the result of an impulsive reaction to recent events in the Persian Gulf area. Others may be concerned about our commitments in this region and the absorptive capacity of the recipient. Many questions need to be addressed.

Although the general composition of this arms package to North Yemen has been known to some members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for some time, these sales proposals are the first to be presented for a country in the Arabian Peninsula following the recent turn of events in Iran.

I hope we are not reacting to these events in Iran merely by increasing arms sales to friends elsewhere in the region. To be sure, our friends in the area are deeply troubled by developments in Iran,

Ethiopia, South Yemen, and Afghanistan. They need reassurance of our political support, but, in this process, arms sales should not be the principal instrument on which we rely to express that support. In the coming weeks and months, we will be observing trends and reassessing policy options in the Persian Gulf and Arabian Peninsula. Our reaction should teach us that large arms sales not lead us to quick fixes such as increased arms sales. The Iranian revolution should teach us that large arms sales are not the sole prescription for protecting U.S. interests.

These arms sales also come at a time when the United States, the Yemen Arab Republic and Saudi Arabia are trying to work out a smoother trilateral arms relationship for the Yemen Arab Republic. Problems have existed with regard to deliveries to the Yemen Arab Republic of the equipment intended for the army. Deliveries are made to Saudi military authorities located in North Yemen, following which the actual dispersal of the equipment to the Yemenis themselves is made after some delays. Unfortunately, none of the parties has had much of a working experience with the first arms package for the Yemeni military to determine whether or not this second package can be successfully integrated.

Mr. Speaker, this unique trilateral arrangement and the Yemeni arms sales program were the subject of recent correspondence between the State Department and Chairman Zablocki and myself. This exchange provides important background to a discussion of the proposed new arms sales package for the Yemen Arab Republic. The correspondence with the State Department follows:

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C., February 1, 1979.

HON. CYRUS VANCE,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We write you concerning the military sales program we have established for the Yemen Arab Republic which is being supported and financed by the Government of Saudi Arabia.

While we support selling reasonable amounts of military equipment to Yemen, we are concerned about administrative, logistic and quasi-political problems which apparently have existed in the trilateral military relationship which has evolved. While a Memorandum of Understanding may not be necessary or changes in the language of LOAs offered, we would expect that before any further proposed sales for the Yemen are submitted to the Congress under provisions of the Arms Export Control Act that firm understandings be obtained and agreed to by all three parties on how this trilateral arrangement will work in the future. We would want assurances that some type of informal, but periodic and regularized, trilateral discussions of this program at an appropriate and agreed upon level will occur so that past problems do not re-occur and delay and frustrate the implementation of an important program in the Arabian peninsula.

We appreciate your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on
Europe and the Middle East.
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., February 14, 1979.
HON. LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Europe and the
Middle East, Committee on International
Relations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Secretary Vance was pleased to receive your letter of February 1 expressing your support for and recognition of the importance of the Yemen military assistance program within the context of our interest in the security of the Arabian Peninsula. He has asked that I respond on his behalf.

I share your concern that this program be administered as effectively and efficiently as possible. While in the past there were problems in the administration of this program, on the basis of discussions with the Governments of Saudi Arabia and of the Yemen Arab Republic, a clear understanding now exists on the essentiality of close cooperation by the three parties involved to see that the program is a success. The Government of Saudi Arabia is particularly concerned and supportive of our efforts to ensure that there is proper and effective management.

Having very much in mind the concerns you expressed we have established within our Embassy in Sana a modestly staffed Office of Military Cooperation which is responsible for the administration and coordination of all aspects of the program. It acts as our primary point of contact with both the Yemen Government, including the Yemen President, and the Saudi military training mission in Sana. Although there is no formal structure, discussions on the implementation of the program take place frequently among representatives of the three parties in Sana. Where necessary, problems are referred to our Embassy in Jidda and the U.S. military training mission in Dhahran for discussion with top Saudi officials.

In addition, the accelerated delivery of the Phase I equipment—Howitzers, LAW, Vulcans, vehicles and recoilless rifles—is proceeding in an orderly manner. The equipment is being disbursed to the Yemen Army while US military mobile training teams assist the Yemenis in learning how to effectively handle and maintain the weapons. Transition pilot training on the four F-5B aircraft already approved for transfer is in progress.

I cannot, of course, guarantee that difficulties will not arise in the future, but the relationships that have developed and been agreed upon over the past six months including the personal involvement of Yemen President Salih and the top leadership of the Saudi Government will allow quick resolution of those problems without detriment to the program. US mobile training teams are accompanying equipment as it is delivered to ensure that the Yemenis can develop the capability to handle it effectively. I am confident that the will exists to see the program through to a successful conclusion.

The informal notifications for direct sale of certain defense articles will be sent to Congress shortly. In addition, pursuant to Section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act, notification of the Administration's intent to consent to transfer of certain defense articles from Saudi Arabia to the Yemen Arab Republic will also be sent to Congress in the near future.

If you or your staff want further background explanation concerning the Yemen program, I will be happy to arrange a briefing by appropriate Department officials.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS J. BENNET, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary
for Congressional Relations.●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of all meetings when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in meetings as they occur.

As an interim procedure until the computerization of this information becomes operational the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, February 27, 1979, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 28

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Nutrition Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1980 for the Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture.

322 Russell Building

Appropriations

Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for Fiscal Year 1980 for the Department of Agriculture.

1224 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 354, proposed supplemental authorizations for Fiscal Year 1979 for NASA, and S. 357, proposed authorizations for Fiscal Year 1980 for NASA.

235 Russell Building

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on proposed Fiscal Year 1980 authorizations for foreign assistance program.

4221 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

To hold hearings on S. 241, proposed Justice System Improvement Act.

2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Defense Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 80 for the defense establishment.

1223 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 332, proposed Consolidated Banking Regulation Act of 1979.

3302 Dirksen Building

Budget

To resume hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the fiscal year 1980 budget.

6202 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To resume hearings on the objectives that a national policy on tourism should seek to achieve.

457 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Regulations Subcommittee

To resume hearings on the Department of Energy's plans for emergency energy conservation and gasoline rationing.

3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Regional and Community Development Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the Disaster Relief Act (P.L. 93-288), followed by hearings on proposed authorizations for FY 80 for the Disaster Relief Act.

4200 Dirksen Building

Finance

To continue hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1980 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and to consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee.

2221 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

Energy, Nuclear Proliferation and Federal Services Subcommittee

To hold hearings on price impact of oil shortages and U.S. energy planning.

357 Russell Building

Joint Economic

To resume hearings on the President's economic report.

1202 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the National Institutes of Health, Department of HEW.

S-128, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the National Institutes of Health, Department of HEW.

S-128, Capitol

Appropriations

State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980, and on supplemental appropriations for FY 1979 both for the Department of State.

S-146, Capitol

3:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Public Works Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, Appalachian Regional Development Program, and the Appalachian Regional Commission.

S-126, Capitol Building

MARCH 1

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 80 for the Department of Agriculture.

1223 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science and Transportation

To resume oversight hearings to assess Government and industrial potential needs for powered "lighter-than-air" vehicles used for surveillance and reconnaissance.

235 Russell Building

Foreign Relations

To continue hearings on proposed FY 1980 authorizations for foreign assistance program.

4221 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Agency for International Development.

1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the National Institute of Building Sciences.

1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Secretary of Energy.

1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the National Institutes of Health, Department of HEW.

S-128, Capitol

Budget

To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the fiscal year 1980 congressional budget.

6202 Dirksen Building

Finance

To continue hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1980 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and to consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee.

2221 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

Energy, Nuclear Proliferation and Federal Services Subcommittee

To continue oversight hearings on the Bureau of Census and to examine the plans and progress of the 1980 decennial census.

5110 Dirksen Building

Human Resources

To review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1980 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee.

4232 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the National Institutes of Health, Department of HEW.

S-128, Capitol

Appropriations

State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980, and on supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1979, both for the Department of State.

S-146, Capitol

3:00 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold an open, followed by a closed, business meeting.

424 Russell Building

MARCH 2

9:00 a.m.
Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to renew programs administered by the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, HEW.
4232 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 354, proposed supplemental authorizations for FY 79 for NASA, and S. 357, proposed authorizations for FY 80 for NASA.
235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To resume hearings on the objectives that a national policy on tourism should seek to achieve.
5110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to review proposed authorizations for FY 1980 for the Environmental Pollution Agency, with a view to making recommendations thereon to the Budget Committee.
4200 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on Federal credit programs.
5302 Dirksen Building

MARCH 5

9:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings on proposed reauthorization for the Andromous Fish Conservation Act (P.L. 89-304).
4200 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Committee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of the Interior, to hear outside witnesses.
1318 Dirksen Building

Budget
To resume hearings in preparations for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the fiscal year 1980 congressional budget.
6202 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed fiscal year 1980 authorizations for the National Rail Passenger Corporation (AMTRAK), and on proposed route restructuring of AMTRAK.
234 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980, and on supplemental appropriations for FY 1979, both for the Judiciary.
S-146, Capitol

MARCH 6

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Energy, Nuclear Proliferation and Federal Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the Federal responsibilities for radiation protection.
3302 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of the Interior, to hear outside witnesses.
1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, Department of HEW.
S-128, Capitol

Environment and Public Works

To consider those matters and programs which fall within the Committee's jurisdiction with a view to submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget.
4200 Dirksen Building

11:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to receive legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1980 from Veterans of Foreign Wars.
318 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Health Resources Administration, Department of HEW.
S-128, Capitol

Appropriations

State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980, and on supplemental appropriations for FY 79, both for the Department of Justice.
S-146, Capitol

MARCH 7

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of P.L. 94-282, establishing the Office of Science and Technology Policy.
235 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs
Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, and Federal Services Subcommittee
To continue hearings on the Federal responsibilities for radiation protection.
3302 Dirksen Building

Human Resources

Child and Human Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to coordinate programs designed to prevent domestic violence.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of the Interior, to hear outside witnesses.
1224 Dirksen Building

Budget

To resume hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the fiscal year 1980 congressional budget.
6202 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Department of HEW.
S-128, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Department of Justice.
S-146, Capitol

Select on Intelligence

Budget Authorization Subcommittee
To hold closed hearings on proposed fiscal year 1980 authorization requests for intelligence operations of the Federal Government.
S-407, Capitol

MARCH 8

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To consider recommendations which it will make to the Budget Committee in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act, to be followed by markup of S. 7, to revise and improve certain health care programs of the Veterans' Administration.
412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the National Consumer Cooperative Bank, and the National Credit Union Administration.
Room to be announced

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of the Interior, to hear outside witnesses.
1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Health Care Financing Administration, Department of HEW.
S-128, Capitol

Environment and Public Works

To consider those matters and programs which fall within the Committee's jurisdiction with a view to submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget.
4200 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Department of Justice.
S-146, Capitol

MARCH 9

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Selective Service System, Council on Environmental Quality, and the National Commission on Air Quality.
1318 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Select on Intelligence

Budget Authorization Subcommittee
To resume closed hearings on proposed fiscal year 1980 authorization requests for intelligence operations of the Federal Government.
S-407, Capitol

MARCH 12

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed fiscal year 1980 authorizations for the National Rail Passenger Corporation (AMTRAK), and on proposed route restructuring of AMTRAK.
235 Russell Building

Finance

Taxation and Dept Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the carryover basis provisions of the estate tax law.
2227 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of HEW.

S-128, Capitol

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980, and on supplemental appropriations for FY 79, both for the Department of Commerce.

S-146, Capitol

Select on Intelligence
Budget Authorization Subcommittee
To resume closed hearings on proposed fiscal year 1980 authorization requests for intelligence operations of the Federal Government.

S-407, Capitol Building

MARCH 13

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the National Endowment for the Arts.

1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of HEW.

S-128, Capitol

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold a business meeting on pending calendar business.

235 Russell Building

Finance
Health Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to control increases in hospital revenues (Hospital Cost Containment).

2221 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Department of Commerce.

S-146, Capitol

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of HEW.

S-128, Capitol

MARCH 14

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 354, proposed supplemental authorizations for FY 79 for NASA, and S. 357, proposed authorizations for FY 80 for NASA.

235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To estimate hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of HEW.

S-128, Capitol

Budget
To resume hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the fiscal year 1980 congressional budget.

6202 Dirksen Building

Finance
Health Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation to control increases in hospital revenues (Hospital Cost Containment).

2221 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of HEW.

S-128, Capitol

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980, and on supplemental appropriations for FY 1979, both for the Department of Commerce.

S-146, Capitol

Select on Intelligence
Budget Authorization Subcommittee
To resume closed hearings on proposed fiscal year 1980 authorization requests for intelligence operations of the Federal Government.

S-407, Capitol Building

MARCH 15

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 354, proposed supplemental authorizations for FY 1979 for NASA, and S. 357, proposed authorizations for FY 1980 for NASA.

235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Indian Health Service.

1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Department of HEW.

S-128, Capitol

Budget
To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the FY 1980 congressional budget.

6202 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Department of HEW.

S-128, Capitol

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Department of Commerce.

S-146, Capitol

MARCH 16

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Office of Human Development Services, Department of HEW.

S-128, Capitol

Budget
To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the FY 1980 congressional budget.

6202 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the Northeast corridor improvement project.

235 Russell Building

MARCH 19

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on the Department of Energy's plans for emergency energy conservation and gasoline rationing.

3110 Dirksen Building

Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee
To resume hearings on the carryover basis provisions of the estate tax law.

2227 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Department of HEW.

S-128, Capitol

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, U.S. Metric Board, and the Legal Services Corporation.

Select on Intelligence
Budget Authorization Subcommittee
To resume closed hearings on proposed FY 1980 authorization requests for intelligence operations of the Federal Government.

S-407, Capitol

MARCH 20

9:30 a.m.
Human Resources
Child and Human Development Subcommittee
To mark up S. 4, proposed Child Care Act, and proposed legislation to coordinate programs designed to prevent domestic violence.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Office of Territorial Affairs.

1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Social Security Administration, Department of HEW.

S-128, Capitol

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation Subcommittee
To continue hearings on the Department of Energy's plans for emergency energy conservation and gasoline rationing.

3110 Dirksen Building

Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee
To continue hearings on the carryover basis provisions of the estate tax law.

2227 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Department of HEW.

S-128, Capitol

Appropriations

State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Federal Communications Commission and the Small Business Administration.

S-146, Capitol

MARCH 21

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearing on the implementation of P.L. 94-282, establishing the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Office of Territorial Affairs.

1224 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Federal Maritime Commission, Marine Mammal Commission, and on supplemental appropriations for FY 79 for the Board for International Broadcasting.

S-146, Capitol

Select on Intelligence

Budget Authorization Subcommittee

To resume closed hearings on proposed fiscal year 1980 authorization requests for intelligence operations of the Federal Government.

S-407, Capitol Building

MARCH 22

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 330, to provide for a judicial review of the administrative actions of the VA, and for veterans' attorneys fees before the VA or the courts.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Environmental Protection Agency.

1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the U.S. Geological Survey.

1224 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Research and Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 14, proposed Reclamation Reform Act.

3110 Dirksen Building

Finance

Health Subcommittee

To mark up proposed legislation to control increases in hospital revenues (Hospital Cost Containment).

2221 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Commission on Civil Rights and the Federal Trade Commission.

S-146, Capitol

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Research and Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 14, the Reclamation Reform Act.

3110 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence

Budget Authorization Subcommittee

To continue closed hearings on proposed fiscal year 1980 authorization requests for intelligence operations of the Federal Government.

S-407, Capitol Building

MARCH 23

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimate for fiscal year 1980 for the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Consumer Information Center.

1318 Dirksen Building

Finance

Health Subcommittee

To continue markup on proposed legislation to control increases in hospital revenues (Hospital Cost Containment).

2221 Dirksen Building

MARCH 26

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Department of Labor, and related agencies.

S-128, Capitol

MARCH 27

9:30 a.m.

Human Resources

To hold hearings on S. 420, proposed National Workers' Compensation Standards Act of 1979.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Department of HEW.

S-128, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Department of HEW.

S-128, Capitol

Appropriations

State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary Subcommittee

To receive testimony from Members of Congress on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary.

S-146, Capitol

MARCH 28

9:30 a.m.

Human Resources

To continue hearings on S. 420, proposed National Workers' Compensation Standards Act of 1979.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Department of HEW.

S-128, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Department of HEW.

S-128, Capitol

MARCH 29

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation to establish an Earth Data and Information Service which would supply data on the earth's resources and environment.

235 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to receive legislative recommendations for FY 1980 from AMVETS, paralyzed Veterans of America, Veterans of World War I, blinded veterans, and Purple Heart.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Veterans' Administration.

1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the National Endowment for the Humanities.

1224 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Departments of Labor and HEW.

S-128, Capitol

MARCH 30

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed legislation to establish an Earth Data and Information Service which would supply data on the Earth's resources and environment.

235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Veterans' Administration, the American Battle Monuments Commission, and the U.S. Army cemetery expenses.

1318 Dirksen Building

APRIL 2

9:30 a.m.

Human Resources

To resume hearings on S. 420, proposed National Workers' Compensation Standards Act of 1979.

4232 Dirksen Building

APRIL 3

9:30 a.m.

Human Resources

To continue hearings on S. 420, proposed National Workers' Compensation Standards Act of 1979.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Office of the Secretary and the Office of the Solicitor.
1224 Dirksen Building

APRIL 4

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the National Science Foundation.
1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service.
1224 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
International Finance Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the implications of the proposed multilateral trade agreements for U.S. exports.
5302 Dirksen Building

APRIL 5

9:00 a.m.
Veterans Affairs
To hold hearings on proposed legislation extending certain veterans' health benefits programs through FY 1980.
5110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the National Science Foundation, and the Office of Science and Technology Policy.
1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service.
1224 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
International Finance Subcommittee
To resume hearings on the implications of the proposed multilateral trade agreements for U.S. exports.
5302 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the role of the Federal Government in providing educational employment.
6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Fish and Wildlife Service.
1223 Dirksen Building

APRIL 11

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Federal Emergency Management Administration.
1318 Dirksen Building

APRIL 12

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of the Treasury.
1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Bureau of Mines.
1223 Dirksen Building

APRIL 24

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Bureau of Land Management.
1223 Dirksen Building

APRIL 25

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To mark up S. 330, to provide for a judicial review of the administrative actions of the VA, and for veterans' attorneys fees before the VA or the courts, and on proposed legislation extending certain veterans' health benefits programs through FY 1980.
412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Department of the Interior, to hear Congressional Witnesses.
1223 Dirksen Building

APRIL 26

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for FY 1980 for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Office of Water Research and Technology.
1223 Dirksen Building

APRIL 27

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.
1318 Dirksen Building

MAY 1

9:30 a.m.
Human Resources
Child and Human Development Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Older American Volunteer Program Act (P.L. 93-113).
4232 Dirksen Building

MAY 2

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for HUD and independent agencies.
1318 Dirksen Building

MAY 3

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1980 for HUD and independent agencies.
1318 Dirksen Building

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, February 27, 1979

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Leonhard Heinmets, pastor, First Estonian Baptist Church, New York, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

In God we trust, let us therefore pray to Him.

Almighty God, the author of the power and authority of all the nations, we praise You for Your grace and loving kindness to this country.

We praise You for the personal and societal freedoms which have developed in this Nation and which we recognize come from You. Lord, we pray that these freedoms may be spread far and wide

and prosper throughout all nations. We especially request that my native country, Estonia, will be able to once again live as a country where freedom and self-determination cheer the hearts of the people.

Father, on this day we beseech You to strengthen America as an example and maker of freedom. Guide her along the path of right judgment.

Bless and guide this elected assembly today to make decisions in accordance with Your will, without regard to any other allegiance.

God, in You we do trust and ask You to bless America.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1902. An act to amend the Bank Holding Company Act Amendments of 1970.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House Proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.